BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

FROM THE LIBRARY OF

HENRY WHITNEY BELLOWS

1814-1882

MINISTER OF ALL SOULS' CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY, 1839-1882.

GIFT OF HIS SON, RUSSELL NEVINS BELLOWS

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER:

INTENDED TO UPHOLD

THE GREAT DOCTRINES

OF

THE REFORMATION;

THE SUFFICIENCY OF SCRIPTURE,

THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT,

AND OF FEARLESS FREE INQUIRY.

"Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up."—JESUS.

"The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light."—PAUL.

VOL. II.

SEPTEMBER, 1827—AUGUST, 1828.

Glasgow,

PRINTED BY JAMES HEDDERWICK AND SON:

AND SOLD BY THE BOOKSELLERS IN GLASGOW AND EDINBURGH;

R. HUNTER, AND TEULON AND FOX, LONDON;

JOHN HODGSON, BELFAST; KING AND RIDINGS, CORK;

B. BATES, NEW-YORK; AND BOWLES AND DEARBORN, BOSTON, AMERICA.

PREFACE.

THE completion of the Second Volume of "THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER," calls upon the Editor to renew his acknowledgments to his various and esteemed Correspondents for their communications. He sincerely and cordially thanks them. He would indulge the persuasion, that the good their contributions have been the means of effecting, will be a sufficient inducement to them to continue their valuable assistance.

It must be evident, that the interest necessary to give effect and importance to a work like "The Christian Pioneer," must mainly depend on the combined efforts of many minds. In this undertaking, as well as in other labours for the improvement and welfare of mankind, it is also true, that union is strength. Here, likewise, the division of labour may be made eminently efficient. Some minds may prefer the highly important department of Critical and Scriptural illustration, whilst others may excel in Essays on subjects affecting the advancement and happiness of the human race; one may place on record the review of thoughts arising on the perusal of interesting works on Theology, History, Biography, Travels, or General Literature; while, by another, articles of intelligence may be more willingly sketched; the pertinent question or apt suggestion may lead to useful and instructive information; the devotional feelings may clothe themselves in harmonious numbers; and even the humblest may contribute the gift of Newspapers or Pamphlets, in which important local controversies, or notices of religious meetings, may be contained. By these varied means, a fund of knowledge may be collected in the Editorial treasury, from which may be brought forth, for the improvement and gratification of the readers, things both old and new. Such aid we earnestly and respectfully solicit; and past experience and present possession lead us to hope, that our anticipations of assistance will be fully realised.

The Editor also returns his thanks to the numerous subscribers to "The Christian Pioneer," for their liberal encouragement. It is in their power to increase his obligations, and, at the same time, further that sacred Cause, the object, he is persuaded, of their mutual wishes and aim, by their recommendation of the Magazine among their friends, and thus introducing it into districts in which it has not, at present, an opportunity of labouring. Surrounded as the Editor is, by persons who boast that their feelings towards Christian Unitarianism, are those "of serious and settled abhorrence"—who proudly prophesy, that "never, either on the mountains, or in the valleys of Caledonia, shall it shake with prosperous fruit,"—the Editor confesses, that, next to the approbation of God and of his own conscience, the kind aid and approval of those at a distance—who are engaged in one common work, the dissemination of pure and undefiled Religion—is to his mind most satisfactory, most cheering. Let that countenance and encouragement be continued, combined, as he trusts they will still be, with the co-operation and friendship of his brethren in Scotland, and aided by the blessing of HIM, without whose blessing nothing can prosper,—and the Editor pledges his unwearied efforts, "to uphold the great doctrines of the Reformation, the sufficiency of Scripture, the right of individual judgment, and of fearless free inquiry," against all gainsayers, believing, as he does, that thereby he will be doing something to promote the diffusion of knowledge, the purity of religion, the reformation of man, the honour of the Saviour, and the glory of the One true God, the Father.

GLASGOW, *September*, 1828.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGES

America, Calvinistic Revivals in, ... 118–148
America, The Christians of, ... 286
America, New Unitarian Periodicals, ... 288
America, Quaker Unitarians of, ... 139–179
Anniversaries of Meeting Houses.
Greengate, Salford, ... 213
Moor-Lane, Bolton, ... 323
Ballykelly, Letter to the Protestant Dissenters in the Parish of, 176–185–338
Beard, Rev. J. R. Summary View of the Controversy between, and Messrs. Carlile and Taylor, ... 52–80–161–189–217–345–361
Birmingham, Controversy between Catholics and Protestants, ... 100
Buckland, Rev. G.—Missionary Journal, ... 349
Bunting, Rev. Jabez, Correspondence with Rev. J. R. Beard, ... 193
Calvinistic Sentiments, Extracts from an Address to a Clergyman holding, ... 8–37–78
Cameron, Rev. John, of Dunluce, ... 253
Chalmers, Rev. Dr. Letter to, ... 131
Channing's, Dr. Remarks on Scott's Life of Napoleon, ... 201–250–273–302–330–370–407
Congregational Magazine, on 1 John v. 7, ... 258
Cooke, Mr. Letter to, ... 97
DEATHS.
Mr. D. Logan, ... 93
F. Boardman, ... 209
Rev. W. Worrall, ... 283
Rev. Dr. Wells, ... 284
Mrs. Scott, ... 359
Mrs. Armstrong, ... 360
Diamper, Acts and Decrees of the Synod of, ... 145
Editor, Notes by the, ... 109–185–247–266
Glasgow Trinitarian Controversy, ... 402
Ireland, The State of Religion in, ... 233
Malabar, History of the Church of, ... 115
Matthew the Evangelist, a Unitarian, ... 266–293–325–365
Mystery, On, ... 297
Napoleon Bonaparte, Dr. Channing's Remarks on, ... 201–250–273–302–330–370–407

PAGES

Nature and Orthodoxy, The Teachings of, contrasted,.....1–45–84
New England, Causes of the progress of Liberal Christianity in,..59–73
New-Year's-Day, A Discourse on, ...244–262–309–377
Pioneer, The Christian.
Synod of Ulster, and Remarks on its Proceedings, ...12–29–97–109–155–412
Letters to the Rev. R. Stewart of Broughshane, Ireland,26–67–102–135
Removals, Resignations, and Settlements of Unitarian Ministers, 36–108–180–216–360–396
Death of Mr. David Logan, ... 93
Mr. F. Boardman,.....209
Rev. W. Worrall, ...283
Rev. Dr. Wells, ...284
Mrs. Scott, ...359
Mrs. Armstrong,.....360
Letter to Mr. Cooke, ... 97
Controversy in Birmingham, between Catholics and Protestants,..100
The Christian Advocate, ...108
Quaker Unitarians,.....139–179
Dr. Drummond on the Trinity,.....141
Prosecutions for Unbelief,.....142
Opposing Bible Societies of Glasgow, ...143
Service of Plate to the Rev. W. Porter,.....211
Anniversary of Salford Meeting-House, ...213
Glasgow Unitarian Chapel,.....213
The Christians of America, ...286
Test and Corporation Acts, ...287–323
American Unitarian Periodicals, ...288
Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society, ...322
Anniversary of Moor-Lane, Bolton, ...323
Controversial Meeting in Salford,.....323
Festival on Repeal of Corporation and Test Acts,.....384
Annual Meeting of Methodist Unitarians,.....390
Sheffield Fellowship Fund,.....391
North Eastern Unitarian Association, ...396
Kent and Sussex Association,.....455
Western Unitarian Society, ...456
Poetry.
Sunday Morning, ... 58
God was not there, ... 92
A Dream,.....124
The Close of the Year 1827, ...166
On the Lapse of Time, ...180
The Memory of Howard,.....232
The Lot of Humanity, ...246
On Truth,.....259–334

PAGES

Porter, Rev. W. Service of Plate presented to, ... 211
Probation, The World a state of, ... 380–397
Review.
Dr. Bruce on the Age of Homer, ... 48
Fleming's Testimony for a Universal Church, ... 168
H. Hutton's Sermon at Belfast, ... 171
Dr. Chalmers' Sermon on Controversies, ... 171
Field's Life of Dr. Parr, ... 235
On the True Worshippers, ... 240
Thom's Three Questions, ... 279
Wellbeloved's Bible, ... 313
J. J. Tayler's Sermon, ... 319
Bible Controversy in Ireland, ... 320–352
The True Canon and Creed of Christianity, ... 357
The Country Minister, ... 358
Salford, Controversial Meeting in, ... 323
Scott, Memoir of Rev. J. 306–341
Scriptures, Inspiration of, ... 125–151–181–227
Scripture, Notes on Passages of, ... 289
Scripture, On the Language of, ... 4–64–89
Scripture, Passages of, explained:—Mat. xxviii. 19; John i. 1–14; John xx. 28; Isaiah ix. 6; Rev. i. 8; Col. ii. 9; Heb. i. 1–8; Mat. viii. 16, 17; John iv. 9; 1 Cor. i. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 32; Rev. i. 10; Job xi. 7–9; Job xiv. 10; Job xix. 23–27; Mat. i. 23; Mat. ix. 2—xi. 27—xviii. 20, ... 4–64–89–106–107–289–290–291–292–317–318–325–326–327
Sheffield Fellowship Fund Report, ... 391
Signatures of Correspondents.
S, ... 4–48–89–302
T. P. 12–41–80
Vindex, ... 29–67–102–135
U. M. 44–121–150
F, ... 53
G. C. S. 59–201–227–240–243–319
W. 100
E. W. Nias, ... 101
D. S. 114–161
Homo, ... 121
H. M. B. 125–168
A Unitarian Protestant, ... 135
☞ 148
R. 180
John R. Beard, ... 193
E. P. 233
N. E. 235

SIGNATURES OF CORRESPONDENTS. PAGES

Peter,.....244
J. M.,.....249
Clericus,.....258
N.,.....293
J. K.,.....309–345
G. Buckland,.....352
D.,.....384–402
A Convert from Trinitarianism,.....407
W. S.,.....456
Stewart, Letters to the Rev. R. of Broughshane, Ireland,.....26–67–102–135
Syria and the Holy Land, Christian Researches in,.....121
Test and Corporation Act Repeal Dinner in London,.....384
Trinitarianism, Convert from,.....247
Truth, The Importance of,..... 41
Ulster, Synod of, and Remarks on,.....12–29–97–109–155–412
Unitarian Associations.
Lancashire and Cheshire,.....322
Methodist,.....390
North Eastern,.....396
Kent and Sussex,.....456
Western,.....456
Unitarian Ministers, Removals, Resignations, and Settlements of, 36–108–180–216–360–396
Unitarian Worthies,—No. 3, Thomas Emlyn,.....198–223
Universal Restoration,.....261
Wardlaw, Dr. Remarks on the re-publication of his Discourses,.....402

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 13. SEPTEMBER, 1827. Vol. II.

The Teachings of Nature and Orthodoxy contrasted.

IT must ever afford the purest delight to the contemplative and pious mind, to discover the great truths of Revelation confirmed and illustrated by the works of nature. The meditations of the Christian will acquire renovated vigour, and a greater intensity of feeling will pervade his breast, when he is capable of deducing from surrounding objects, of demonstrating from natural events, the validity of his opinions. On every side he beholds traces of the existence, operations, and perfections of a God. He perceives that regularity and order pervade every thing which surrounds him—that evident and striking traces of design are manifested wherever he turns his eyes. He reflects on the admirable connection, the mutual dependence so universally prevalent, the adaptation of parts in the minutest detail, or their uniformity in a comprehensive aggregate; and he concludes, upon the most incontestable principles, that One all-wise, all-powerful, undivided, all-animating Mind, must be their primary Original.

Impressed with the truth of the existence of God, the philosophic inquirer proceeds to examine more minutely the objects around him; and he finds every spot in creation inscribed with indelible characters of infinite power, traced by the finger of the One Almighty, until he exclaims with the Psalmist, in a glow of devotional fervour, "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty, the earth is full of thy riches!"

Commencing with the lowest link of the chain of creation, we find the principles of crystallization in full activity, and the sparry concretions assuming their different forms in the depths of the hardest rocks. By combinations of apparently but slightly varying materials, are produced the variegated marble, the crystal-formed spar, the glittering diamond, the green emerald, and the blushing cornelian. The vegetable world advances us a step in the scale of contrivance, and we discover, evidently, the design of combining pleasure with man's means of existence, and

4638

administering conjointly to his comfort, preservation, and happiness. The grass which grows beneath our feet, covering the earth with a mantle of verdant green, exhibits a profusion of beauty. The flowers which bloom in endless variety, scenting the air with odoriferous perfumes, compel admiration by the exquisiteness of their colouring, and the delicacy of their tints; and the boundless diversity of fruits, which not only delight the eye, but impart that gratification to the palate which the skill and refinements of the voluptuous cannot emulate,—all demonstrate the power, and wisdom, and goodness of Jehovah. "Oh that men would praise the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works to the children of men."

The animal creation opens fresh prospects to our view. From the animalculæ, half-vegetable half-animal—from the microscopic objects which lay claim to animated life, to the bounds where vision commences cognizance—and through all the gradations of existence hence ascending, up to man himself,—all exhibit the effects of infinite wisdom. The smallest speck of animated matter possesses a beautiful and admirably framed mechanism, which is adapted, not to the support merely, but to the enjoyment of life. The body of a gnat is as completely organized, as carefully furnished with all the machinery and disposition of parts requisite for the purposes of motion and activity, as is the huge bulk of the majestic elephant. The ephemeral insect, which only lives its hour, fluttering in the sun-beam, possesses a frame equally exquisite in its contrivance and arrangement, with the most elaborate parts of the human body. In mechanical contrivance, man in his construction boasts no superiority.

In addition to the complicated and wonderful machinery of his frame, however, man possesses those mental powers which invest him with a commanding dignity in the present world, and apparently ally him to a superior, though unknown state of being. With man, our knowledge of the *mode* of existence ceases; into the void before us we cannot penetrate. What beings, besides the inhabitants of earth, range in different degrees in possession of varying habitudes in creation, we know not. Nor are we much wiser with respect even to ourselves. Revelation imparts the knowledge, that death is but the confines of this life, and the harbinger of another—the passage to a different world—the beginning of real, not the end of all

existence. But this information does not satisfy the curiosity of man; conjecture lends her aid when he meditates on this future existence, and popular speculation peoples some fancied region—not our homely and material world, but a more favoured spot, the region of the blessed, with disembodied spirits, the souls of good men made perfect; and cherubims, seraphims, archangels, are allotted an existence in some indefinite, and probably indefinable space called heaven. If in danger of being lost in these inextricable mazes, we may return to safe and solid ground, by confessing our ignorance of the *modes* of existence of other and differently constituted beings, as well as our ignorance of the *manner* of our own future existence, without denying the fact of that existence, and therefore may, without inconsistency, maintain as a rational doctrine, that the universe is filled with intelligent beings, that it teems with proofs of a Creator's power.

If we confined our attention indeed to this planet simply, redundant as it is in beauty, and bearing the holy impress not only of an Omnipotent, but also of an all-beneficent Deity, we might be disposed to allow, that there exists some apparent probability on which to ground popular opinions,—that it is in some respects natural and plausible to infer, that the earth comprises all that is worthy of notice —if it is not the whole of creation, at least that animated life extends no farther—that here is the product of the most powerful energies, the mightiest effort of the Divine Architect—that this is his inimitable work—and, consequently, that man ranks as the first created existence, all other things being made solely for his benefit or pleasure. We might, on this ground, imagine that the sun was formed to dispense light and heat to him alone; and that the stars were sprinkled over the vast concave of heaven, for the only purpose of pleasing man by their beauty.

Pitiable, however, is the intellectual situation of those who embrace such conclusions. Yet, limited as they are, they are nevertheless generally prevalent, where the treasures of knowledge have not been scattered abroad, nor the advantages of instruction, in ameliorating the condition of the human race, been called into operation. But it is reasonable to suppose, from the present tone of public feeling, that the mass of the people will, by means of education, be eventually raised to a far higher station of mental excellence, than perhaps those friends of the species

most alive to the dissemination of knowledge, may consider themselves warranted in anticipating. Be that as it may, a spirit of inquiry is already manifested, which must produce the happiest effects. And as information upon every subject, is seized with avidity by thousands who have hitherto been lost in the darkness of ignorance, therefore will more adequate and correct perceptions of the power of God, be also entertained by many who previously possessed no ideas of those stores of wisdom, which unfold the most magnificent and transcendent views of the Deity, as seen in his works; which, pointing through nature up to Him who sits sublime upon its riches, fills the mind with devout awe at the Almighty's creation; which cannot but impart true lessons of humility, and effectually destroy the presumption of the race of Adam.

The Bible reveals, that God is Omnipotent, and the universe which he has formed, demonstrates its truth. But Omnipotence cannot be scanned by the finite, circumscribed powers of man; the subject is too stupendous —too overwhelming; his fancy grovels; his imagination, inadequate to the task, confesses its inability to picture the lofty magnitude, the profundity, the extension of the Almighty's works, or to trace the boundless, interminable, illimitable creation. But he may still offer to the God of all, the aspirations of frail mortality, and tender his homage of reverential adoration. And he may exclaim, "When I view the heavens the work of thy fingers, the moon and stars which thou hast ordained, Lord, what is man that thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that thou visitest him?"

(To be Continued.)

On the Language of Scripture.

(Continued from vol. I. page 404.)

MATTHEW xxviii. 19.—*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* This text is the first in the New Testament, which is urged in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. It is indeed admitted to be the principal passage, and excepting the benediction which concludes the Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* is the

* Dr. Wardlaw prudently declares, "that it is not his purpose to enter at large into the evidence of the Trinity in general. I shall rather go

only text that can with any sort of pretension, be brought forward in favour of a doctrine which sets common sense at defiance—a doctrine not less irrational than transubstantiation. Other passages indeed are adduced, from which it is inferred, but the judicious Christian will not appeal to far-fetched inferences, to prove a doctrine of vital importance. If the Trinity is a doctrine of revelation, it will be plainly communicated. But we who have read the Scriptures with the sincere desire to come to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, and who, certainly, are not biassed by secular considerations in favour of our views of Christianity, have not been able to discover a single passage in which this doctrine is inculcated; and we know, that many who have been educated in Trinitarian prejudices, after a serious and attentive perusal of the Oracles of God, have been led reluctantly to renounce the doctrines to which they were strongly attached, and to the professors of which, the honours, emoluments, and approbation of the world are appropriated. We declare our conviction, that the Trinity derives no support from Scripture, but is a doctrine of human invention. It owes its origin to Heathen philosophy; and we are enabled clearly to trace its rise and progress from this source.

The obvious interpretation of the passage seems to be this: Go to all nations, instruct them in the principles of Christianity, and receive into the Church of Christ, by the ceremony of baptism, those who believe that the Christian Religion was revealed by the Father of all, was communicated by his beloved son, Jesus, and was confirmed by miraculous powers. "The design of the words

---

forward to those of the New Testament, proceeding, at the same time, with regard to them also, on the same principle, selecting only one or two of the most prominent passages." He adduces only two. Would not one suppose from this language, that he had many passages in reserve? But Dr. Wardlaw knows that these two, Mat. xxviii. 19, 2 Cor. xiii. 14, are the only texts, which will bear a moment's investigation in evidence of the Trinity. Of the celebrated passage 1 John v. 7, he says, "Of these (prominent passages in favour of the Trinity), most of you will doubtless expect, that one, at least, if not the very first, should be the remarkable verse in fifth chapter of the first epistle of John. 'For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.' And certainly, this text should have been entitled to hold the first place, had its genuineness been undisputed, or disputed as that of many texts have been, on slender grounds. I freely acknowledge, however, that the evidence of the spuriousness of this celebrated passage, if it were even much less conclusive than, in my mind, it appears to be, would be quite sufficient to prevent me from resting upon it any part of the weight of this argument."

is this," writes Dr. Lardner, "that they should teach men to receive and profess the doctrine which Jesus had taught with authority from God the Father, and confirmed by miracles done by the finger, the power, or the spirit of God." The Greek word ονομα, *onoma*, is used to denote doctrine. Schleusner shows, that it means doctrine, religion, and especially the Christian religion, and the profession of it. See Mat. x. 22, xii. 22, xix. 29; Mark xiii. 13; John xvii. 6; Acts v. 41, ix. 15.

"That baptism into the name of any person," observes Mr. Belsham in his Calm Inquiry, "signifies nothing more than the acknowledgment of his authority, and expresses no belief in his proper Deity, is evident from what the Apostle says of the Israelites, 1 Cor. x. 2, that they were 'baptized into Moses.' And when the same Apostle expresses his apprehensions, 1 Cor. i. 15, 'lest any should say that he had baptized into his own name,' he could not suspect, that they would represent him as claiming divine honours, but merely, as assuming to be the head and leader of the Christian sect. Nor does the uniting the name of the Son with that of the Father and the Holy Spirit, in the administration of baptism, prove the deity of Christ, or that he is any thing more than an exalted human being, much less does it prove that he is the proper object of religious worship. For, waiving the consideration, whether the text be genuine, whether it was intended as a formulary of the rite, whether the names of the Father and Spirit were ever used in primitive baptism, whether the precedents in the New Testament are not all into the name of Christ only; and finally, whether a positive institution, which contains no direct address to an invisible being, can, with any propriety, be regarded as an act of religious worship; it is certain that no inference of equality in rank or homage can be drawn from the association of different names in the same sentence. See 1 Chron. xxix. 20, 'All the congregation bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king.'—1 Sam. xii. 18, 'The people feared the Lord and the king.'—1 Tim. v. 21, 'I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things.'"

1. That the interpretation which we have given is correct, appears from the words which were employed by the Apostles in the performance of the baptismal service.

"Baptism," says Dr. Wardlaw, "was to be administered in the name of all the three, in the very same way." Dr. Wardlaw has not been in the habit, we suppose, of reading the Acts of the Apostles, and must surely have access to sources of information, from which all other Christians are withheld. Luke has related many instances of baptism, but has not mentioned one example of the use of the form of words in Mat. xxviii. 19. Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ," Acts ii. 38. "They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," Acts viii. 16. "He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord," Acts x. 48. "They were baptized in the name of the Lord," Acts xix. 5. If the words in Matthew were given as a baptismal formulary, and were designed to inculcate the doctrine of the Trinity, they would certainly have been used by the Apostles, and by all the primitive Christians. But they baptized in the name of Christ, an expression, which, according to our interpretation of the passage in question, declares the same sentiment as the words used by Christ. They were baptized in the name of Jesus, *i. e.* into the religion of Jesus, the messenger of God, who confirmed his mission by signs and miracles which He did by him.

2. Had this passage been intended to be a baptismal formulary, and to convey the doctrine of the Trinity, it would have been recorded by the other Evangelists. But Mark, Luke, and John have not recorded it: an omission, in our opinion, unaccountable on the popular interpretation. As Christ uttered no other form of words which can possibly be perverted to favour the doctrine of the Trinity, had the Evangelists been Trinitarians, they would have carefully preserved the text under consideration, in all their Gospels. But the words are no where else to be found than in Matthew.

If these observations are founded in truth, the great support of the Trinity is removed. This momentous doctrine, a belief in which is now asserted to be essential to salvation, is not revealed in the Four Gospels, in the Acts of the Apostles, or in any book of the New Testament. The concluding benediction of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which is urged in proof of the doctrine, we shall hereafter endeavour to show, is no proof of, nor contains any allusion to, the doctrine of the Trinity.

(To be Continued.)

Extracts from a Manuscript Address to a Clergyman holding Calvinistic sentiments.—No. I.

Do you ask what are those grand principles of religion and sources of happiness, which the heretical Unitarian holds in common with all those who acknowledge the divine authority of the Scriptures? They are such as the following: That there is One only God, of infinite perfection, the sole Creator and absolute Disposer of the Universe—a God who, in the plainest language of those writings, is "*good to all, and whose tender mercies are over all his works;*"—that Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified by Pontius Pilate, was "very man," and that he delivered, by a divine authority, precepts of the purest religion and morality, which he illustrated by a life of uniform and spotless obedience, under the most difficult and trying circumstances, and thus exhibited a most perfect example for our imitation; that he suffered and died, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring them unto God;" that God did not suffer "his holy one to see corruption," but, on the third day after his crucifixion, raised him from death to a state in which "he dieth no more,—death hath no more dominion over him;" and that this great and glorious event is a proof and pattern of a similar event to all his faithful followers, when he shall appear again to "judge the world in righteousness," and to reward every man according to his works. These, Sir, are some of the great leading principles, which, in common with yourself and the great body of professing Christians, we derive from the Scriptures.

Now, Sir, I appeal to your own sober judgment, whether these principles, insisted upon by the Unitarian, whom you refuse to acknowledge as a brother, and appear to regard as an enemy, are not of the greatest and most indispensable importance? Without a God of infinite power, and of universal, impartial, and pure goodness, what would become of poor mortals, or of that admirable system of nature by which they are sustained and cherished, and their various powers of action and enjoyment are exercised, gratified, and improved? And when they "return to the dust out of which they are made," whence could they derive their hope of an immortality of life and of elevated bliss, but from the glorious Gospel of the ever-blessed God? Had they no elder brother to conduct them through the

dark valley of the shadow of death, to the light of everlasting life, could they penetrate the thick veil of oblivion which is thrown over them in the grave, and raise their affections from earth to heaven, in that admirable manner in which they are instructed by the precepts, and by the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus? Were erring, sinning man not assured that God is merciful to forgive his sins, on repentance, and that, "knowing his frame," he will overlook many of his failings, provided he is himself ready to make due allowances for those of his fellow-mortals, where would be his confidence, what his solace, in reviewing his past sins, or his encouragement to future efforts for improvement? When he reflects on the many and grievous trials and persecutions to which those "of whom the world was not worthy" have been subjected, while their selfish and merciless oppressors have been clothed in purple and scarlet, and fared sumptuously every day, where can he look for the final triumphs of true religion and virtue, but to the accomplishment of those glorious predictions of the ultimate establishment of the kingdom of God and his Christ, which abound in those treasuries of divine wisdom? Amid all the inequalities which prevail in the allotments of men in this life; in which avarice is accumulating its thousands and tens of thousands, and humble, useful industry is crushed like the moth, under the foot of his lordly superior; in which scriptural truth is branded as damnable error, and darkness is put for light, and light for darkness,—ah! where shall the eye of reason and humanity turn for a ray of heavenly light to relieve the sad perspective, but to the glorious declaration of "the Son of God according to the spirit of holiness,"—"The time is coming when all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth; they that have done well to a resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to a resurrection of judgment;" and "*every man shall receive the reward of the things done in the body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*"

But, Sir, though I suppose you will not deny that these doctrines are taught in the Bible, nor that they are of great importance, yet you appear to regard them as of no real value, as devoid of all saving efficacy, unless connected with those other tenets which you term evangelical doctrines, and regard as the essence of vital Chris-

tianity. It is here, indeed, that you most essentially differ from the Unitarian; for, to his apprehension, so far are those tenets from having any necessary connection with the principles which you mutually maintain, that they are totally irreconcileable with each other. There is no subject which has been more fully investigated by persons originally "orthodox," and who became Unitarians in consequence of the inquiry, than the question, whether the doctrine of three persons in the Godhead, and the other tenets to which those of your persuasion have appropriated the epithet *evangelical*, are actually taught in the sacred writings. Their researches have terminated in the conviction, that, however some few terms and phrases severed from the context, and viewed through the medium of creeds since formed, may seem to favour such opinions, yet, when impartially considered in their just relation to the context, and with the scope of the writer, the circumstances and the idiom in which he wrote, and with the general contents and purport of the Scriptures, those opinions do not and cannot form any part of them, being in reality, at variance with their great and universally acknowledged principles. We will endeavour to illustrate this last conclusion, by a few examples.

There exists, we mutually maintain, a God of infinite perfection—the Creator, and absolute Disposer of the universe. If so, all created existence, and every modification of it, must be the effect of his power, and depend wholly on his will and pleasure; nothing can exist or act, but in subservience to his purposes. But with his other perfections, he unites infinite goodness: "God is love." He can do nothing and permit nothing, in which goodness, loving kindness, and mercy, are not the actuating motives. How, Sir, can such a Being first create, or suffer to be introduced into being, myriads of creatures incapable of obeying laws which he prescribes, and then destine them to endless torments for not doing that of which they are incapable? Can any two ideas be more irreconcileable with each other, than those of a God who is love itself, who is "*long suffering and kind, very pitiful, and of great mercy;*" who is represented by the father in the parable, anticipating, with lively compassion and parental joy, the penitential confession of his disobedient son, and who actually received the Gentiles, notwithstanding the gross criminalities of their past conduct, into his blessing

and favour, on their forsaking their idolatries, and embracing his gospel,—and that Father, who, according to the Calvinistic system, exacts with inexorable severity, an obedience which is wholly impracticable? Surely, Sir, if the one be true, the other *must* be false; both cannot, form any part of the revealed will of God. But it is plain to all, that the former representations are contained and inculcated in the Scriptures, and a certain fact, that the Divine Being graciously overlooked the past sins of the Gentiles, and received them into the number of his peculiar people, on their repentance and submission to the authority of Christ; it necessarily follows, that his character is the reverse of that inexorable severity, which it is represented by the Calvinistic system.

Another plain, undeniable, *evangelical* truth, in the detail of which, the Gospel histories are in a great measure occupied, is, that the Lord Jesus came to instruct us in our duty; that his many excellent precepts and lessons of religion and morality, are of divine obligation, and that those only are his genuine disciples who "*do the things which he said;*" and also, that his conduct and conversation, and particularly his suffering meekness, is their "*example that they should follow his steps.*" Now, Sir, how can these plain, palpable truths, running through those interesting narratives, and every where conspicuous in the admonitions of the Apostles to their converts—truths, indeed, which live and breathe throughout the New Testament, be reconciled with the supposed evangelical doctrines, that mankind being incapable of obeying the divine commands, Christ obeyed, and also suffered the infinite agonies which were otherwise destined for them all, in the place and stead of a certain portion of them? You assert that in consequence of this, a third person in the Deity, whom you term "God the Holy Ghost," by an overpowering influence on the minds of these elect, reversed their nature in favour of holiness. But even admitting the truth of this strange position, it will not serve the purpose of reconciling these palpable inconsistences; the precepts of Jesus being, in the first instance, according to your system, addressed to a world incapable of obeying them; and that a select few should be afterwards impelled by a reversion of their very nature, to yield an obedience, which is nevertheless represented as so imperfect, that his substituted righteousness and suffer-

ings were necessary to effect their salvation, takes not a little from that incongruity and injustice which leaves the great majority of mankind to suffer endless punishment, on account of their total incapacity of obeying his commands, or imitating his example. The doctrines, therefore, that Christ "*called upon all men every where to repent*," and obey his precepts; and that his own obedience, particularly under sufferings and death, afford an example for their imitation; and the tenet, that his righteousness and sufferings are a substitution for those of a select few, while the mass of human beings are left to suffer everlasting misery, as the inevitable consequence of a total incapacity of yielding any acceptable service to their Creator, are irreconcileable with each other. But as the former is a plain, indisputable doctrine of the New Testament, and the latter maintained in its full extent by none, except the followers of John Calvin, as the interpretation of certain passages, which by others, are understood in a sense perfectly consistent with that plain, rational, and universally acknowledged principle, which alone preserves the consistency of divine revelation, it follows, that the *substituted* obedience and sufferings of Christ, can form no part of the contents of the New Testament.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *September* 1, 1827.

SYNOD OF ULSTER, AT STRABANE—*Orthodox Test.*

WE now give the continuation of Mr. MONTGOMERY's admirable speech:—And for what is all this tyranny to be exercised, this disgrace to be incurred, this wound to be inflicted on religion? Why, that we may not be liable to the accusation of having a "diversity of opinions amongst us!" That is to say, we do differ, and we know that we shall continue to differ, but we will hold out false colours to the world, we will cast dust into the eyes of the multitude, and try to make them believe that "there is peace, when there is no peace." This may seem very fair in the eyes of some, but to me it appears to be rank Jesuitism and hypocrisy. Yet this alone can be the "*unity*" for which many are such strenuous advocates. I do not think so meanly of their understandings, as to believe that they aim at any other kind of uniformity. *Uniformity of Faith!* Oh, that such a phrase had never been heard by the ears of man—that such a vain idea had never flitted across his imagination! What dungeons has it crowded! what tortures has it inflicted! what oceans of innocent blood has it shed! what tears of widows and of

orphans has it caused to ascend in sad memorial before Heaven! Leaving its mightier horrors, what havoc of integrity has it produced, in the ordinary walks of life! what lips has it sealed against the utterance of truth, or opened to the utterance of falsehood! what private and political oppressions has it sanctioned! what barriers has it opposed to the progress of religion, and the emancipation of a world! Uniformity of Faith! Why, two of us can scarcely agree respecting the most ordinary occurrence of life. On the subjects of literature and philosophy, manufactures and commerce, government and laws, there is an endless diversity of opinions. And can we, then, possibly expect to be exactly of one mind on "the high and deep things pertaining to salvation?" So long as human nature is constituted as it is, varying in dispositions and talents, subject to all the influences of education, society, and interest, a vast diversity of religious tenets must necessarily prevail. Nothing less than the immediate interposition of Heaven, could produce perfect uniformity. And when we consider that such uniformity never has been attained, it would be a libel on the Deity, to suppose that it is essential to the salvation of his people. Such an impious supposition would imply, that an all-wise and gracious Being, had given a religion to his creatures, inadequate to produce the effects for which it was designed. But I do not require to urge this upon Presbyterians, who spurn at the idea of "exclusive salvation," and rejoice to think, "that many shall come from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, and shall sit down in the Kingdom of God."

Were uniformity of faith, however, *desirable*, (which, to me, seems exceedingly doubtful,) I am persuaded that creeds, and confessions, and other "devices of men," are not the means adapted to produce it. The very Churches which taunt us with our varieties of faith, and reproach us for permitting the disuse of our "ancient standards," have as great diversities of opinion in themselves, as prevail amongst us. We might fairly turn upon them, and say, "Physicians, heal yourselves!" It is as notorious as the sun at noon-day, that the Established Church, at this very moment, is divided into two great parties, of Arminians and Calvinists; not to speak of minor divisions. I have seen a low Arian, if not Socinian work, written not many years ago, as I have been told and believe, by a Dignitary of that Church, turning the doctrine of the Trinity, and Archbishop Magee's view of the Atonement, into contempt and ridicule, in the most indecorous manner. And we all know, that from Tillotson down to the present age, many of the brightest ornaments of that Church, have wished that "she was well rid of the Athanasian creed." Do I mention these things, from any invidious feeling towards the Established Church? By no means. I believe the clergy of that Church to be a very respectable body of Divines, many members of it are amongst my best friends, and some of the most pious Christians I ever knew, were of its communion. But I consider the state of that Church, as a striking proof of my position, that uniformity of creed does not necessarily produce uniformity of faith. And when, on a previous day, I spoke of a few of the clergy, as showing themselves anxious about the dismissal of Mr. Porter from the Clerkship, and interfering in the settlement of a Presbyterian Congregation, I meant no reflection on the clergy of that Church, as a body. If some of them became "busy bodies in other men's matters," I am convinced that ninety-nine out of one hundred of them, would condemn such injudicious interference, as much as I possibly could. But, whilst I thus express my respect towards the Established Church, I trust I shall be pardoned for not falling into that extreme courtesy, (so common amongst us of late,) which would exalt her above the Church to which I conscientiously belong. I would hold it disgraceful to continue a *Presbyterian*, if I preferred the doctrine, discipline, or worship, of *any* other Church: and I freely confess, that I

should place very little value upon a compliment from any man, who told me, that he considered *my* Church superior to his *own*, whilst he remained in that which he disapproved.

If we turn to the Church of Scotland, it will not afford us much stronger proof of the efficacy of a uniform creed. There, the Confession of Faith reigns in all its glory: yet, I have been told, (and I speak under the correction of Mr. Carlile,) that there is not on earth, a body of men of more diversified religious sentiments, than the ministers of the Church of Scotland. Nay, it has been more than hinted, that the very seats of learning are not free from heresy. Rumour tells a strange tale of a subscription scene in one of these venerable seminaries. When a Professor was elected, who was pretty generally known not to be as orthodox as John Knox, the person who presented the Confession of Faith to him for signature, simply enough, asked him if he *believed it?* This, the learned gentleman very well knew "was not in the bond." "You have nothing," said he, "to do with that: hand it here, and I'll *sign it*." There may be persons who admire this mode of producing a uniform and orthodox faith; but to me, it seems awful to think that a man would be excluded from the ministry, or any other office, for avowing the *truth*, who would be considered duly qualified for admission, by putting his solemn signature to a *lie!*

I was wrong, however, in saying that there is no Church in which uniformity is to be found. There is one, which at least boasts of being the same, in every age and clime and country—the Catholic Church. But are those who most strenuously press forward this Declaration, admirers of the beautiful uniformity of *that* Church? I suspect, that whilst some of them would not join me in my cordial wishes to see the benefits of the British Constitution extended to our Catholic countrymen, they will all unite with me in admitting, that the uniformity of the Catholic Church, powerfully tended to bring on "the gross darkness" of the middle ages, to retard the Reformation, to clog the wheels of science, and thereby to arrest the progress of civilization. The fact cannot be concealed: the uniformity of Catholicity has spread darkness over Spain and Italy; and the noxious weeds of Atheism and Infidelity have sprung up, under its shadow, in the fair and fertile regions of France. This, however, in my mind, would have been the effect, though probably in a less degree, of any other system of faith which had attained equal power and extension; for it seems to be an ingredient in the nature of all Churches, to delight in the exercise of authority, where they have power; and to follow as a natural consequence of uniformity of faith, that inquiry should cease, and the independence of the mind be annihilated. The truth is, controversies and discussions, which can only arise from diversity of opinions, seem to be as necessary to preserve the knowledge and energy of religion, as the motion of the waves to purify the waters of the ocean; but the misfortune is, that in "the strife of words," the spirit of the Gospel is too frequently lost.

I put it then to the Synod of Ulster, whether, in the pursuit of a shadow, a visionary uniformity, they will trample upon the right of private judgment, the very foundation of their Church, and wilfully "lay a snare for the feet of weak brethren." A curse lies upon him "who causeth a brother to offend;" and I ask, is there a man in this house, who does not believe, that if this Declaration be passed, some will assent to it with the lips, but not with the heart or with the mind? I beseech you to pause, before you commit an act which must "cause some to fall." "Lay not the flattering unction to your souls," that the sin will lie solely at the door of him who shall make an insincere declaration. Every man who is concerned in passing it, will be "a partaker in his sin." I can readily conceive what a struggle of nature there may be in many a heart, where the best feelings of humanity will be dragging

the unhappy victim different ways. If he assent to a creed which he believes not, he is for ever degraded in his own estimation; he shudders in the presence of his God. But he is a husband and a father, and if he resolve to put on the high unbending port of a martyr, and to utter that which will make a bigoted multitude expel him from his congregation, what must be the conflict of his spirit! Unqualified for any other profession, perhaps in the wane of life, "to dig unable, and to beg ashamed," he sees, in prospect, his comfortable home made desolate, the partner of his bosom in tears, the children of his affection crying to him for that bread which he can no longer give! I ask any person, that has in his bosom "a heart of flesh," can he wonder, if the most powerful feelings of nature, should overcome the stern commands of conscience? Can it create surprise, if the unhappy man should say, "I will not leave HER desolate, whom in the fond fidelity of my heart, I solemnly swore to protect; I will not leave the pledges of our love without the sustenance of nature, without the means of education. No: I will make this hateful Declaration; I will cast myself upon the mercy of Him who knows the pangs of my heart; I will wear my knees in secret prayer; I will wet my pillow with tears of penitence; and if all be too little to procure pardon for my offence, I may die without hope, but not without the consolation that I have sacrificed myself, for objects dearer to me than life!" Oh! let us not call such a man a wretch, or a hypocrite; he is a husband and a father! Let us rather make the case our own, and not "cast a stumbling-block in his way." Let us not send him into that place, from which nothing but the voice of sincerity and truth should ever be heard, with a heavy conscience, and a falsehood upon his soul! If we do, his blood may be required of the authors of his crime.

But, it may be alleged, that I under-rate the firmness and virtue of our ministers. Possibly I may. And what is the reward proposed for those that will maintain their integrity? Why, you will kindly cast all the odium you can upon them, in these fanatical times; you will distract their congregations, turn them adrift, if you can, and give them the charity of the world for their portion. But you will not have many thus to endow. Those may be courageous, who are free from danger, and very upright, who have nothing to forfeit by their integrity. But I shall recall to your minds a passage in the history of a man, with whom no individual here would dare to put himself in competition. I allude to the virtuous and illustrious Cranmer, the Father of the Reformation in England. In the awful reign of Mary, his love of life prevailed over his integrity, and he was induced to sign a paper condemning the Reformation. This sacrifice, however, did not save him; for, having degraded, they resolved to destroy him. Being led to the stake, and the devouring flames kindling around him, he stretched forth his right hand, and held it in the flames till it was consumed, repeatedly calling out, in the midst of his sufferings, "O that unworthy hand!" Who, then, shall boast of the firmness of ordinary men, when he who was bold enough to rebuke the Eighth Henry, yielded for a season to his fears?

There will, I admit, be a few honest men, whom you may have the comfort and glory of exposing to inconvenience, or injury. But your triumph will be very limited; for if you pass your Test, I calculate that many will very soon perceive their errors. Amongst the first to rush forward to sign it, I suspect, will be a man who told me, if worldly interest and popular applause ran as high in favour of New Light, as of Old Light Doctrines, he did not believe there would be above *half-a-dozen* Orthodox Ministers in the Synod. This may be an erroneous estimate, but he is proud of being a particularly accurate man in his calculations. Next to him, in the race, will come, I should suppose, another eminent Divine, who yesterday accused a better man than himself of blasphemy, but who has, nevertheless, a very comfortable idea of the compressible

nature of a ministerial conscience, as I have heard him declare, "that he only required to know a minister's congregation, in order to tell his creed!" Oh, what a pure body the Synod of Ulster will soon be, and how much of one mind, if you but give them a good confession!

But I have been told, that all this is proposed in pure kindness, in order to bring back the stray sheep into the true fold. This, I am bound to believe, is all true, as the principal promoters of the plan are, no doubt, superior to ordinary Christians! But whilst the *motive* may be approved, I must say, the *means* seem but ill adapted to the end. There is a kind of resistance in human nature, to the exercise of anthority, where no title to exercise it appears. There are some minds not very accessible to the logic of majorities, and which cannot comprehend the meaning of a threat from their equals. I tell you plainly and sincerely, if you think us in error, you must take other means to convert us. Uncharitable denunciations, and unwarranted attempts to coerce our consciences, will rather wed us to our opinions. I shall venture to tell you a fable, in proof of this position. In ancient times, as the *Sun* and the *Wind* were chatting together, they beheld a traveller passing over a plain, with a cloak over his shoulders. Just for a frolic, they laid a wager, as to which of them could soonest deprive him of his cloak. The Wind was to have the lead: and, mustering all his strength, he blew East and West, North and South, in the most violent and ingenious manner. But although the poor traveller was nearly blown down, he would not part with his cloak: the stronger the blast, he just wrapped it the more closely about him, and held it with the more determined grasp. At length, the Wind exhausted himself with puffing, and gave up the task; when the Sun, who had retired behind a cloud, gently and gradually looked past the skirt of it upon the traveller, who held his cloak tightly for a while, remembering the rough usage he had experienced. But as the storm was past, and as the day became genial, he gradually relaxed his hold; the Sun put forth stronger beams; the cloak was thrown open; the traveller paused; the Sun poured forth the full tide of his splendour and his heat; the cloak gradually descended from the shoulders of the traveller, and he stood, subdued and melted, in the glorious presence of the God of Day! The Wind is the fury of persecution: the Sun is the genial influence of Christian love. The cloak of error, if such there be, will only be held more tenaciously in the hurricane; but in the gentle calm of kindness, in the hour of friendly intercourse, it may be laid aside for ever. There is a pride in the human heart, which resists compulsion, though it will readily yield to love.

I see, on the other side of the house, a gentleman who has long been a leading member of this body, and who has lately distinguished himself, both from the pulpit and the press. I refer to my friend, Mr. Stewart, whose sermon in defence of Orthodoxy, I hold in my hand. In the preface to this discourse, he tells the world, what I knew long ago, that he was first a Calvinist in his boyhood, that he was afterwards very sceptical on the doctrine of the Trinity, and that it was only in the year 1825, he turned his attention to the Bible, to see if it contained what he *now* calls the Fundamental Doctrine of the Scriptures; which, unless a man believe, he is on the verge of Atheism! Now, had the proposed declaration been brought forward in 1824, Mr. Stewart, as an honest man, could not have signed it. He might then have been "cut off as a rotten branch," and that very act of severity would, in all likelihood, have confirmed him in error. But see the happy consequence of kindness and moderation:—He, who might have continued an Arian, a Heretic, a Semi-Atheist, peculiarly dangerous on account of his talents, is now the zealous champion of Orthodoxy, and one of the powerful enemies of Catholic error! What *has* been, *may* be. In two years, if you do not "lop us off," Mr. Porter, or myself, may be edifying the world with dissertations against our present opinions!

But consider farther, if you pass this Declaration, you must extend it to Probationers as well as Ministers. Now, you tell the people, that they have a right to choose their own Pastors; but if they should not like a Calvinist, where are they to procure a Teacher? I presume they must either submit to your dictation, or remain without a Minister; which would be rather a singular way of consulting their rights and privileges.

Mr. Cooke, and others, have been pleased to denominate those who differ from them, as "wolves in sheeps' clothing." This implies, that we have assumed a false character. So far as I am concerned, I treat the insinuation with contempt. But, I do admit, there are in this body, "wolves in sheeps' clothing:" men who have lived with us in Christian communion, who have pretended to entertain for us Christian friendship; but who now, when they are confident in numbers, turn upon us, and would devour us. These are the *real* wolves.

But we have also been compared to soldiers, entering a garrison for its defence, and afterwards turning our arms against our companions. Surely Mr. Cooke intended this as a hit at himself and his partisans. I came into the garrison with the same colours which I now wear; I have always kept them flying; and whether I remain in it, or be driven from it, I shall keep them aloft, so long as I have an arm to bear them. There are, however, traitors amongst us: men who came into the fortress on the avowed condition of mutual toleration and forbearance, and who engaged with us to defend it against the common enemy. But now, that they think *themselves* able to maintain the bulwarks, they treacherously turn their arms against their comrades, and would drive them out defenceless upon the world. These are the *real* traitors.

Mr. Cooke's similies are only to be equalled by his charity. He has given us a new version of Christian unity. He has talked a great deal about unity of the Spirit meaning unity of the Spirit's testimony. These are idle words, which sound in the ear, without conveying any idea to the mind. Every ignorant enthusiast, down to the lowest dregs of fanaticism, talks most presumptuously of "the testimony of the Spirit," and appeals to his own feelings as a proof that he is right. But when Mr. Cooke says that he is only to love those of his own creed, and to view those who differ from him, as he would regard robbers, I tell him, that he is listening to the testimony of his own passions, not to the spirit of truth. There were persons of old, who loved only their own tribe and nation, "who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others;" but our Saviour showed that the poor Samaritan understood the nature of brotherly love infinitely better than the Priest and the Levite. It may be said, this was only an act of charity to the body; but surely, if we are bound to love "that which perisheth," we are much more constrained to love "that which endureth for ever." It is one of the greatest evils of our unsanctified contentions, that they tend to restrict the charity of the Gospel, which enjoins us "to love *all* men, and to do good unto *all* men,"—even that charity, which the Apostle declares to be superior even to faith and hope.

I have not entered into any defence of my peculiar tenets, though I believe them to be capable of a rational and scriptural vindication, because I know that such a course would only widen a breach which is already too large. But I can assure you, that whatever my opinions are, I hold them in great humility; under the most profound sense of my own weakness, and liability to go astray. In coming to the conclusions at which I have arrived, I can truly say, that I have sought light and direction, where alone they are to be obtained. I have never read the Scriptures, with a view to ascertain their meaning, without first imploring the gracious assistance of the Divine Spirit, to free me from prejudice, presumption, and error, and to lead me to a right understanding of the truth. Neither have I ever sat down to write a sermon, or any

religious discourse, without praying to God, that I might be enabled faithfully and truly to interpret his holy will, and to instruct his people. And I can farther say, in perfect sincerity, that I never enter a pulpit, without a profound sense of my responsibility; nor do I ever venture to address any people, until I have secretly and fervently entreated the protection and guidance of Heaven. I may not have asked with becoming humility, and devotion, and faith; but I trust I have asked in sincerity. And if I be yet in error, I believe God will enlighten my mind: if I be right, I trust He will grant me fortitude to maintain my integrity, in despite of unmerited obloquy, and "to speak boldly the whole counsel of his will." For myself, and those who think with me, I feel that I am entitled to claim at least the humble merit of being *sincere*. The world may consider us *fools*, for not conforming to its maxims, and pursuing its gains; but it would require the malignity of a demon to call us *knaves*. I believe, though many of my brethren be in error, that simple error is not a condemning sin; and I sincerely hope, that the great Shepherd may collect his sheep from many folds. If I thought that all who differ from me were to go down to destruction, I could not enjoy one hour's happiness.

I conclude by entreating you, not to enter upon a measure at variance with the true principles of your Church; and which must eventually end in division and weakness. For myself, I have, as you all know, nothing either to hope or to fear. But "for my friends and brethren's sake, I would say, Peace be within your Zion." Arianism has been persecuted, frequently unto blood, for fifteen centuries, which must prove that it cannot be subdued by mere human power. This, however, is certain, "If it be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot prevail against it."

Mr. Hogg (Armagh) inquired whether Mr. M. referred to him, in his allusion to a certain Minister, who had expressed his belief, that if Arianism was as popular as Trinitarianism, he did not think there would be six Trinitarians in the Synod?

Mr. Montgomery.—I do. Mr. Hogg.—Where was it?

Mr. Montgomery.—It was at an Ordination dinner; and when you made the observation, I requested a person at table to take notice of what you had said.

Mr. Hogg.—Was it *after* dinner? Mr. M.—Yes.

Mr. Hogg.—Oh, then, I was only in jest!—*(Laughter.)*

Mr. Magill (holding in his hand a copy of the Commissioners' Report,) proceeded to rebut the arguments of Mr. Montgomery, on the preceding evening. He commenced by saying, that although Mr. Montgomery had advanced many arguments against this Body's signing a Test, or Declaration of its faith, yet he was prepared to prove, that Mr. Montgomery had already signed a Confession of *his* Faith, in putting his signature to the evidence he had given regarding the religious opinions of this body, in his examinations before the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry.—[Here Mr. Magill read, from the Examinations of the Commissioners, Mr. Montgomery's evidence.] This is a public Testimony, given before a Commission of the House of Commons. Now, where is the difference between the Ministers of the Synod signing a Declaration of their belief, and Mr. Montgomery signing his? If there be any difference, it is in this,—the one declares that Christ is God, and the other, that he is not God. In the code, also, Mr. Montgomery sanctions subscription.—[Mr. Magill read from the Code, the law which directs young candidates, when licensed, to sign their answers to the questions put to them.]—Mr. Montgomery calls on young men to sign, in the books of the Bangor Presbytery, their belief in certain doctrines, and yet he will oppose a declaration on similar principles from the members of this Body.

Mr. Montgomery.—I do no such thing. We require them to declare their opinions; and this Synod may make fifty such declarations, if it please.

Mr. Magill.—Well, then, surely we have a right to sign this Declaration, without injuring Mr. Montgomery, or taking from him his congregation or his stipend. For the struggle has now come to that point, that by this Declaration the Synod must stand or fall. The contest is now between Arianism and Truth! *(No, no.)* Yes—it is; for I do believe, from the bottom of my heart, that the doctrine of Arianism is utterly false. Let Mr. Montgomery deny his Divine Lord and Master —*(hear, order, no,)*—I mean to say (said Mr. Magill), let him deny the supreme Divinity of Christ—we, at least, will not desert our Heavenly King and Supreme God of our Salvation! With regard to the high reputation which certain Ministers of this body have given to the great leading Arian characters, let us inquire into the truth of their statements. Sergius the Monk assisted Mahomet in composing the Koran—he was an Arian; for Mahomedanism is erected on Arianism: they are the same. Newton has been quoted as an Arian example. Newton was not an Arian: Newton was a great philosopher who came to illumine the world, and give new light to the views of mankind.

"God said, Let Newton be, and all was light."

Mr. Carlile.—Moderator, I rise to order; this is absolute blasphemy.

Mr. Magill.—It is a quotation from Pope, one of our greatest poets; the quotation has not been given right, however: it is,

"Nature, and Nature's laws, lay hid in night,
God said, Let Newton be, and all was light!"

surely this is no blasphemy. But I am willing to be put right. Newton was not an Arian—Locke was not an Arian. Abernethy has been quoted: now Abernethy took from this Synod the very Meeting-house and Congregation in Antrim, at present under the care of the Presbytery of Antrim. Mr. Magill then went on to describe the overthrow of Arianism in the South of Ireland, [Mr. Montgomery denied the correctness of this statement,] and to expose certain Members of the Synod who had misquoted Scripture; and entreated the Synod to separate the clean from the unclean. He then recalled to the recollections of those present, the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and deplored the awful situation of the souls of men, when, in the valley of sorrow and tribulation, and in the awful hour of death, they had no hope on which to rest, except the cheerless religion of the Arian, who had robbed the Lord Jesus of more than half of his divine and blessed attributes. O members of the Synod of Ulster! O servants of Jesus! do not send forth from your body a single man as a messenger of the Great God of Heaven, who will prove a rotten reed in the awful hour of death and terror—when the great account is about to be rendered up at the dreadful day of judgment to the God of our salvation. But I will not detain this house, in its anxiety to put on record, by the Declaration of this day, its denial of the truth of those writings which have appeared in Belfast, in London, and in Glasgow, in which this is asserted to be an Arian body. Mr. Magill then quoted the passage from the Gospel of Matthew, "Any man who will deny me, him will I deny before my Father, which is in Heaven;" and said, now is the time to avow Christ—now let the servants of Jesus Christ acknowledge their master—"All hail the power of Jesus' name!"—"Bring forth the royal diadem, and crown him Lord of all!" —*(Order, order.)*

Mr. Carlile.—I do protest against this display of Mr. Magill's eloquence —it is perfect profanation.

Mr. Leonard Dobbin (an Elder) said, that his sentiments were so fully expressed yesterday, by his esteemed friend Mr. Mitchell, and others,

that he would not now trouble the meeting with any observations, were it not, that, representing a most respectable congregation, it might be expected he would not withhold his opinion on the present occasion. He had no objection to the general bearing of the Declaration, although the words did not exactly meet with his approbation; but he was decidedly hostile to subscription. He considered any act of that description, infringing on our dearest privileges as Presbyterians, and trenching on the right of private judgment. If the Synod once adopt the principle, it is impossible to say where it may end; as many cases are likely to arise, in which differences will occur. He would suppose one: some of your most orthodox Ministers may say and agree, that the soul of man, after it leaves the body, is in a progressive state of improvement until the final judgment: this would be supporting the doctrine of Purgatory. Another Declaration, and another Subscription, would be necessary to refute this doctrine; and so on, whilst any difference of opinion should arise. But, in debating this question, *Ministers seem to have forgotten their Congregations;* as such proceedings would be spurned at by the great body of the people represented by him. He apprehended many divisions, and much disputing in the Congregations of this Synod would arise, should a Test be passed; and he was satisfied such a measure would be most injurious to the welfare of Presbyterianism in Ireland. The doctrine of Charity, "which thinketh no evil," was so ably laid before you by your late respected Moderator, in his sermon on opening this Synod, that he (Mr. D.) was surprised it seemed to have been so soon forgotten; for he could not bring himself to think that no evil is intended, if you adopt subscription. He felt, that a division of this body would soon follow—which he had no hesitation in saying, appeared to be the intention of some Members of Synod. He would, therefore, oppose the measure, as far as in his power, both here and elsewhere.

Mr. Reid (Rathmelton) said, that the Synod was in such a situation, that its members were called on boldly and fearlessly to avow their religious opinions. Not to perform this necessary duty, would do serious injury to the Presbyterian religion in Ireland. The doctrine of the Trinity is the basis of the whole Christian fabric—remove it, and the entire system must crumble into ruins!

Mr. Cooke said, that we had heard it asserted, in one of the most brilliant speeches ever delivered in this, or, probably, any other assembly, that the present measure is an infringement on the rights of private judgment. This he (Mr. Cooke) denied, although he was aware that the influence of that most eloquent address was still operating on this body; and his attempt to overturn the arguments it contained, consequently lost much of their influence. He readily admitted that the gentleman who delivered it, was a man of much more talent than he was; but there was left to him the consolation, that God had hidden many things from the wise and the learned, and had revealed them unto babes! Mr. Cooke then proceeded to argue, that the nature of the present motion was by no means any infringement on the right of private judgment, inasmuch as it left every man free to sign or reject the Declaration.

We have also been delighted with a fine piece of splendid imagery about the sun and the wind, and a traveller and his cloak. But this cloak he would liken to a cloak which wraps us round, and hides us from the knowledge of our people; and which prevents the glorious beams of the Sun of Righteousness from heating and warming our frozen hearts of unbelief. We do not know these travellers who wear such cloaks; perhaps these are the cloaks that will make, or have made, those hypocrites, so much dreaded by certain eloquent speakers. Perhaps it is these cloaks that hide from our view those clergymen who are regularly in the practice of importing from London a certain work called the *Christian Moderator*—a work established with the view, and for the very purpose,

of sapping and undermining the means of our salvation, as conveyed to us from our Lord Jesus, in his divine word! He knew the men who received this work, and distributed it extensively in the congregations of this Synod; he knew the shop in Belfast to which it came; and he knew the direction of every parcel as it arrived!!! These are the men who wear the cloak, to preserve them from the wind and the rain; and they are calling out, "Let us alone—we are dying a natural death!" But shall we let these men in cloaks alone, whilst they are stabbing the dearest interests of our souls' salvation in the most vital part? Shall we,—Oh! shall we leave these hidden and cloaked emissaries from our enemy's camp alone, that they may lay the mine, and set fire to the train which will blow up the citadel of our faith? These sappers and miners are busily at work, in their cloaks; and they are calling out "Leave us alone—Leave us alone!"—whilst they are already under our very walls. There is also another enemy, in one of these cloaks, busy in the undermining of our works—

Mr. Montgomery begged to set Mr. Cooke right, regarding his use of the fable of the traveller and his cloak. He never said that the Anti-Trinitarian members of the Synod wore a cloak of hypocrisy, as Mr. Cooke had endeavoured most unfairly to insinuate: but that in Mr. Cooke's estimation, and that of some of his friends, they were wrapped round with a cloak of error. Mr. Cooke will also please explain who this ally of the *Christian Moderator* is; and whether he means to say that I get parcels from London of these books.

Mr. Cooke.—There was another work of a still more dangerous description, which ministers of this body were labouring most earnestly to circulate in their congregations. He knew the days on which the parcels of it arrived—he knew the time on which they were despatched from their delectable depository—and he knew the messengers who traitorously conveyed the train of crime and mischief into the enemy's camp—these sappers and miners in the train of irreligion and infidelity!—Shall we calmly wait till the mischief be done; or shall we now, and at once, drive these traitors from amongst us?

Mr. Montgomery.—Name, name.

Mr. Cooke.—The book is the *Pioneer*, printed in Glasgow; and is no way behind its London compeer, in its erudite labours to rob our Lord and Master of his crown of eternal glory and power! The ambassador I do not choose to name. I do not believe Mr. Montgomery is one of those persons who write and distribute these precious books; but I could name them, if I chose.

Mr. Montgomery.—Really, Mr. Cooke's grounds of belief cannot be very tenable, when such contemptible trifles as he would represent those publications to be, affright him so horribly.

Mr. Cooke wished to impress on the house the real danger to be apprehended from these "trifles." An ignorant man who goes into an apothecary's shop, may take up a medicine, which, to a man of skill, who knew how to compound it with another medicine, might prove harmless when swallowed; but if taken in its crude state by the ignorant, would be certain death. So it is with these works—they may be "trifles" in the hands of the skilful, but death to the untaught. He (Mr. Cooke) would endeavour to show what effect these "trifles" would produce. One "trifle" is, to show that the Bible does not contain the great leading articles of our faith. Another "trifle" is, to prove Christ to be a mere man, such as he now saw before him.—Is *this* a "trifle?" Another "trifle" is, to represent Jesus Christ as an exalted angel, and the Holy Ghost as a nonentity! That is no "trifle," for it takes away from mankind the blessed doctrine of the Atonement! Is it a "trifle" to take away the Lamb who shed his blood for the remission of our sins?

Mr. Montgomery said, it was most unfair in Mr. Cooke, to confound

and mix up the doctrines of Arianism and Socinianism, which he well knew were so essentially different. Such a course could only be pursued to mislead the public mind, and to create unmerited odium.

Mr. Cooke.—They are twin-brothers; *par nobile fratrum*. The gentleman who so eloquently addressed you yesterday, made a powerful appeal to your feelings as husbands and fathers. The picture was painted in lively colours, to produce effect, and to strike the eye of the superficial inspector. But, suppose that all he has said, prove reality, shall such consequences drive us from the discharge of a duty we owe to our Heavenly Master? Let us not dread any consequences—let us disregard even the tears of our wives, and the cries of our children. Yes, it is evident the gentleman knew how to enlist the weakness of humanity on his side; but the whole was the work of the hand of a conjurer, which lighted the candle that gave a momentary power and effect to the phantasmagoria of his imagination.

Mr. F. Blakely said, that, after the eloquence and arguments which had been used by Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Denham, and others, he did not intend detaining the house, more especially as their time was very precious. But he felt bound, in justice to himself, to make a few observations. His opinions were so well known, at home and elsewhere, that he had nothing to dread from the issue of the present question. He was not a Trinitarian; and he was aware that his sentiments had been caricatured, and that it had been said by misguided people, that he had no Saviour; but though he might labour, and suffer reproach, he would trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men. Many might set up to be masters over him, but one was his Master, even Christ, and all his sincere disciples, of every Church, he would consider as brethren. He might be charged with depending on his own righteousness for salvation; but he was too well acquainted with his own weakness and imperfection, to trust to such a false principle; and so well, he thought, with his Bible, as to know and believe, that he must trust to the grace and mercy of God in Christ Jesus. His brethren, who assisted him on sacramental occasions, knew that he spoke fully and freely his sentiments to his Congregation. He would not be a hypocrite, in the Synod or out of it; and after all that had been said about a cloak, there was no man who would venture to charge him with requiring any. He had heard, with much pain, much misrepresentation of sentiments, from different quarters; but was certain that truth, more than triumph, should be the aim and object of every Christian. He was surprised at some observations which had been thrown out regarding the Reformation; and begged to remind his brethren, that the Bible, and the Bible alone, was the religion of Protestants. The right of private judgment, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures, were the very pillars of the Reformation. He did not charge any member of the house with setting up for infallibility, but he was sorry to remark, that he had heard something very near it, or at least approaching to it. As for the propositions contained in the motion, he would not sign them, even if he believed them; because it would be giving up his right of private judgment, and suffering others, no better than himself, to influence him by threats. Like his brethren, he was liable to error; but he was open to conviction—and as Mr. Dill had, in some measure, thrown down the gauntlet, he had no objection to meet him, or any of his brethren, at a proper time and place, and have a friendly and Christian debate on these matters.

Mr. N. Alexander rose, and observed, that in addressing the assembly, he would neither be so long nor so loud as Mr. Cooke, whilst he should endeavour to state his reasons for not signing this Confession of Faith. He then proceeded to urge the differences amongst the Calvinistic members, on yesterday, regarding the terms which should be employed whilst speaking of the Godhead, as one reason why it is impossible that all men

should arrive at the same conclusion on this important and mysterious doctrine. Another reason was, that he knew many young members who had not yet come to a decision on this subject, although they had for years calmly and studiously investigated the matter. Another reason why he would not sign it, was, that as there have always been differences of opinion in the Church of Christ, and as such differences are likely to continue, he would not sanction any measure which might lead to a split of this body, and thereby weaken, if not destroy, its permanent usefulness. Besides, when he beheld an attempt made to change a Presbyterian assembly into a Popish council-chamber, he thought he also saw in the distance racks and gibbets, and all those instruments of torture which have been so often employed to coerce and keep in chains the human mind. He implored the liberal and reasoning portion of the Synod not to lend themselves to such an inquisitorial proceeding; and concluded by expressing his belief, that the enlightened era of the 19th century, would never witness the success of such a scheme.

Mr. Heron said, he was a member of Synod for 26 years, and in all that time he had scarcely spoken two sentences; but he could not bring himself to give a silent vote on this momentous occasion. He had no objection to the Declaration now proposed, for it contained his doctrines. But he will not subscribe it as a Test; because he never yet saw either the Calvinistic or Arian Creed, to which he could give his name: his creed was to be found in the Bible, and to no Test of human formation would he give his signature. He has heard a threat held out, that printed lists would be circulated of the names of those who refused to sign this Test of Mr. Cooke. He would tell the Synod, flatly and roundly, that he cared not a farthing that 50 copies of it were sent into his Congregation. He concluded a very eloquent address, by observing, that he never knew subscription to effect any purpose, except to make hypocrites and knaves; and therefore he never will put his name to this, or any other human Test.

Mr. Stewart of Broughshane said, you have been most ably and eloquently appealed to, by Mr. Montgomery, on the subject of persecution. The man who takes the vantage ground, is sure to carry with him the prejudices of the assembly he addresses. For example, if he (Mr. S.) recollected aright, it had been reported in the public papers, that at a public meeting of merchants and other public characters, Mr. Montgomery did not think it wrong to denounce this Synod, as composed of men who were guided by a spirit of bigotry and intolerance; and to say, that the inventors of steam had done more good to mankind, than the ministers of this, or any other religious body.

Mr. Montgomery.—I did not apply "bigotry and intolerance" to this body; but to certain members of it, who were strenuously opposing the establishment and success of Mechanics' Institutes. Nor did I say, that the inventors of steam had done more good to mankind, than the ministers of this body; but that it might be a question, whether an Arkwright or a Watt had not rendered more service to the world, than those divines, who were labouring so devotedly to prevent the spread of knowledge amongst the ignorant and untaught.

Mr. Stewart argued, that the observations of the last speaker, on the occasion referred to, had the effect to produce on his mind the impression, that Mr. M. meant to say, that the arts and sciences should be preferred to the study of religion. The Bench of Bishops and the Synod of Ulster were also coupled, in Mr. Montgomery's charge of their attempting to retard the march of the public mind. He would say just one word about the popular feeling so much talked of. It is a strong mark of the truth being embodied in this doctrine, that there is such a popular feeling excited on the subject. Those ministers who are Arians, and who have Arian congregations, are not placed in temptation. Mr.

F. Blakely or Mr. Montgomery are not thereby put into temptation; and he begged clearly to disavow the propriety of applying the term "wolves in sheeps' clothing" to these gentlemen. Indeed any one who knew Mr. Montgomery at College, or elsewhere, could not with honesty apply such an epithet to him. But it was those ministers who cloak themselves from their people, that are the "wolves in sheeps' clothing," and which this measure will and ought to bear hard on. They are the persons we wish to see dragged into light. Let those congregations which are Arian, keep their Arian ministers; but do not allow the people to be hoodwinked by false and treacherous teachers. Which of you will keep a cook in your employment, who is suspected of preparing poisonous food for yourselves and your families?

Mr. Carlile addressed the assembly at some length, in a most eloquent appeal to their judgments and their feelings, as men and as ministers of the gospel of peace, on the want of Christian charity which had been manifested throughout the whole of this discussion. He had witnessed, with pain, epithets the most opprobious; insinuations and assertions the most uncandid, and sarcasms biting and bitter; the whole of which proceeding was strongly opposed to the lessons given by our Lord and Master, to his disciples and followers. There was an evident want of Christian charity in the hearts of many speakers who had addressed the house; and their sentiments and conduct were calculated to do every thing but promote brotherly kindness, and true Christian charity. He passed a warm eulogium on the conduct and proceedings of the Independents, whose example he conceived worthy of the consideration of the Synod of Ulster. He concluded a beautiful address, by imploring his brethren to endeavour to instil into their bosoms a greater portion of Christian charity.

After some bustle, and several attempts of other members to address the house, and the understanding that that part of the motion which required signatures be omitted, the Clerk prepared to call the roll—each member to stand up on answering to his name.

Mr. Montgomery here rose, and requested leave to retire; observing, that he did not wish to be present when such proceedings would take place, as he was afraid were about to be transacted in that house.

Mr. F. Blakely followed Mr. Montgomery, expressing himself to a similar effect.

Mr. S. C. Nelson requested the Moderator to cause the Clerk to read the motion about to be put. Which being done, Mr. Nelson said, he could not sign it: he was not a Trinitarian—he was not an Arian—he was not a Socinian. Were he permitted, he could draw up his own creed; but he would not sign this Test; and he was also desirous to be absent when others would do so.—Mr. Nelson then retired.

We believe that Mr. Orr (of Killead) also retired on similar grounds.

The roll being called, 117 Ministers and 18 Elders answered, "I believe the doctrine;" 2 Ministers answered, "Not;" and 8 declined voting. The Clerk was instructed to report in round numbers, and not to take down names.

On Monday, the Clerk read the Minutes; and when Mr. Porter came to that part, where he had, conformably to his instructions, stated that 135 members had voted, "I believe the doctrine," and that two had voted, "Not," Mr. Cooke immediately started up, and expressed himself thus: "Moderator, this is not a fair representation of the result of the vote—and the conduct of our Clerk on this occasion, shows how necessary it is, that we should watch vigilantly over the official conduct of men who are swayed by party *motives*, and have purposes of their own to serve:—Mr. Porter has omitted to state the number of the members who withdrew from the house before the Roll was called—and the number of those present who sunk their votes!"

Mr. Porter—This, Moderator, is a direct impeachment of my integrity, and one which I do most indignantly repel. I was instructed by the house, to record the gross numbers of those who voted on each side of the question, and this I have done. More I could not do. In the name of common sense, how was it possible for me, when calling the roll, to ascertain how many of those who did not answer to their names, had previously returned home—how many had withdrawn when the question was about to be put—and how many remained in their seats without choosing to vote? Before the roll was called, I received no instructions to make such a discrimination; and when the roll was concluded, I had no means of making it. By collecting information from different members of the house, you may, no doubt, make a tolerably accurate discrimination of the kind required, respecting the Ministers who did not answer to their names; but with respect to the Elders it is utterly impracticable. Supposing me so completely destitute of common honesty, as to be capable of practising imposition, I must be equally destitute of common sense, had I attempted doing so in the case before us. Must I not have been perfectly aware, that the minute on this subject would be read over this morning in open Synod? and how then could I expect to escape detection? Mr. Cooke must think me a fool, as well as a knave; but, independently of this, I would ask, what interested view could I have, in omitting all notice of those who did not answer to their names? By stating the number of those who withdrew from the house, in disgust at what they termed a scandalous procedure, and of those who sunk their votes, would I not have magnified the strength of my own party, and diminished the comparative majority against us? According to Mr. Cooke, I have attempted a dishonourable trick, for the purpose of weakening my own cause! I charge that gentleman with having used language highly improper and disorderly; and I call on you, Moderator, to tell him so.

Being thus called on, the Moderator said, that Mr. Cooke was not *strictly* in order. To which Mr. Porter replied, that this expression did not sufficiently characterize Mr. Cooke's language, and that he again called on the Moderator for protection. Out of the house he could defend himself, but there it was the duty of the Moderator to see that no member was injuriously treated. Mr. Porter having paused, and the Moderator continuing silent, Mr. Porter said, he must now take the matter into his own hands, and repay Mr. Cooke in his own coin, by declaring, that he presumed Mr. Cooke judged of other men's motives by the evil ones by which he himself was actuated.

On information communicated from different members, it was then agreed, that the state of the vote should be thus recorded:—"Before the Roll was called, 4 Ministers begged leave to withdraw—117 Ministers, and 18 Elders voted—'I believe;' 2 Ministers voted 'Not;' 8 Ministers declined voting."

The following Protest was handed in, signed by a number of Ministers and Elders, against the decision of Synod in passing a *Declaration of Faith*:—

"The undersigned, Protest against the proceedings in this case, for the following reasons:

1st,—Because we regard this measure as being, in its introduction and progress, a direct violation of the law of Synod, which requires, that 'all matters originating before the Synod, shall first be submitted to the Committee of Overtures, and remain upon the Synod's books, for at least one year.'

2d,—Because it is obvious, and has been so admitted by the friends of the measure, that it cannot assure the Synod of the sentiments of any individual, even for a day, and is therefore nugatory.

3d,—Because we cannot give our sanction to a proceeding, which,

especially under the popular odium now so generally excited, evidently creates a temptation to insincerity.

4th,—Because we do not approve of the practice of bearing solemn testimony to a mysterious doctrine of pure Revelation—in the words of man.

5th,—Because as put and carried, this measure operates directly as a test of individual faith; is strictly inquisitorial in its nature and effects, and such an infringement on Christian liberty as is without a precedent among us, and wholly inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our Church."

When the Minute relative to the Home Missionary Committee was read, Mr. Magill moved, and Mr. S. H. Rowan (Elder) seconded a motion, "That the former Committee be not continued; and that no *Arian* be appointed as one of its members." A very warm discussion ensued, in which it was asserted by Dr. Wright, and other orthodox ministers, *that Mr. Cooke was in the habit of assisting and preaching for an Arian minister; and that he (Mr. Cooke) received the sacramental elements through the hands of an* ARIAN, *and dispensed them to the communicants.* Mr. Cooke acknowledged that he did so; but it was for the purpose of assisting in the overthrow of Arian doctrines!!!—Motion lost by a majority of 21.

Mr. Cooke presented a Protest, signed by 11 ministers and 1 elder, against the motion which had passed in the morning, to retain the present Committee for managing the affairs of the Home Missions. The objections urged were, that there being *Arians* in the Committee, we cannot expect any thing but destruction to the Society! The entering of the Protest was opposed, chiefly by orthodox ministers; Mr. Fletcher Blakely having seconded it. Passed—19 voting for insertion, and 17 against it.

Mr. M'Cay gave notice, that he would next year give notice of a motion for marking with disgrace any member of this body, who would join in communion with any minister of the Presbytery of Antrim!

To the Reverend Robert Stewart, Minister of the Gospel, at Broughshane, Ireland.—Letter 2.

SIR,

THE violence of proselytes has long been proverbial; and I regret to add, that your conduct forms no exception to the general rule. According to your own admission, it is only a few short months since you returned to the orthodox faith; and you hasten to signalize your reconversion by harsh and uncharitable censures, and a vindictive persecution of those men, with whom you had lived on terms of friendly intercourse, and with whose creed your own so lately coincided. Was this merely the effervescence of newly-awakened zeal, or did the wisdom of this world whisper, that you should try to establish confidence in your *wavering* faith, by a sacrifice of early opinions, and early associates, and of all the charities of life? Perhaps it was a magnanimous offering on the altar of duty; but I will freely confess, that I could have pardoned you, if you had discovered some of the amiable weaknesses of our nature, by not joining in a crusade against those men, whose opinions you had so recently abandoned.

Having thus disposed of your prefatory matter, I shall now proceed to discuss the validity of those reasons which you have assigned, for a very remarkable change of creed.

To me it appears evident, that the principles which you have laid

down, as establishing a belief in the incomprehensible doctrine of the Trinity, subvert the foundations of *Protestantism*, and lead directly of *Popery*.

Permit me to ask, Do you believe in Transubstantiation? I can well imagine how your protestant zeal will kindle into a flame, at the bare mention of such a question. "Impossible! How can any man in his senses believe such downright absurdity?" Such would doubtless be your reply. But softly, my good Sir. I admit that it is indeed highly absurd; and that no powers of language could convince me of its truth. Yet I will undertake to show, that *you* are bound at once to receive it, as an article of *your* creed. You must acknowledge that it is not more difficult to understand, than the doctrine of a *three-one God*. And in defence of it, it may be urged, that the question of the real presence, "*must be answered by Scripture information alone; all attempts to answer it by information drawn from other quarters, will be as unsuccessful as they are presumptuous.*" Now, the Scriptures inform us, that "Jesus took bread, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins." And in another passage we are told, that "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."—"*How this can, or cannot be, we are unable by reason or philosophy to explain. We can only reason of what we know—upon subjects of which we are competent to form ideas. We may assert that it is absurd, but absurdity implies obvious contradiction; contradiction implies knowledge and ideas, and of the nature of God we have seen that we can form no definite idea whatever. The subject is above our reason, and therefore not contrary to it. There are a thousand things in ourselves and our situation, which we admit as facts, the reality of which we never doubt, but which in their nature we must acknowledge to be above the reach of reason, and, of course, inexplicable. Is it rational for us to admit, upon the evidence of our imperfect senses and experience, the reality of a thousand things, the nature of which we can neither comprehend nor explain; and at the same time deny the statement of inspiration, because we cannot comprehend or explain it?*"

You at least must admit the force of this reasoning, for it is *your own*, and the very words, with the exception of Scripture quotation, which you employ in support of Trinitarianism. They apply with equal force to the mysterious doctrine of Transubstantiation. Indeed, if we are to take the language of the New Testament in its strict literal meaning, without presuming to exercise our judgment in the interpretation of it, then I have no hesitation in affirming, that of the two, the latter doctrine is the more strongly supported. They are both founded on false and absurd explanations of some passages in holy Scripture; but are wholly at variance with its true spirit and intention, and with the plainest deductions of common sense. But if men are interdicted the use of their understandings on such subjects, there is no more difficulty in believing the one, than the other. It ought not, therefore, to excite our surprise, in these days of *conversion*, and *perversion*, to be informed, that in some of your various journeyings southward, "you had renounced the errors of Protestantism, and been reconciled to the Catholic Church!"

Since the above was written, I observe, by the newspapers, that you have been entertaining the public by an exhibition of yourself, in a polemical combat with Father Macaulay, of Bally-mena. The whole of the proceeding reminds me so forcibly of a dispute which took place be-

tween two Quack Doctors, in the days of Oliver Goldsmith, and which he has described with infinite humour in his Citizen of the World, that I cannot resist the inclination to transcribe a part of the story, for your edification:—"And yet the great have their foibles, as well as the little. I am almost ashamed to mention it. Let the foibles of the great rest in peace. Yet I must impart the whole to my friend. These two great men are actually now at variance: yes, my dear Fum Hoam, by the head of our Grandfather, they are now at variance, like mere men, mere common mortals! The champion Rock advises the world to beware of bog-trotting Quacks; while Franks retorts the wit and the sarcasm *(for they have both a world of wit)*, by fixing on his rival, the odious appellation of Dumplin Dick. He calls the serious Doctor Rock, Dumplin Dick! Head of Confucius, what profanation! Dumplin Dick! What a pity, ye Powers! that the learned, who were born mutually to assist in enlightening the world, should thus differ among themselves, and make even the profession ridiculous! Sure, the world is wide enough at least for two great personages to figure in. Men of science should leave controversy to the little world below them; and then we might see Rock and Franks walking together, hand in hand, smiling onward to immortality."

To do justice to the poor priest, in this case, he seems to have been alarmed for the injurious effects which the contest was likely to produce on the passions of the multitude, already sufficiently inflamed; and was anxious to decline the war. But in the fulness of self-estimation, and reckless of the consequences, and anticipating, no doubt, an easy triumph over your less assuming opponent, you bearded him in such a manner, that he was reluctantly compelled to buckle on his armour. And what has been the result of all this mighty preparation, this vaporing and bustle? After much silly discussion, totally unworthy of men of enlightened minds, and an interchange of *vulgar personalities*, each party has claimed the honour of the day, erected a trophy, and sung *Te Deum*, for victory.

And to transmit to distant times the history of this illustrious warfare, in a manner suited to the dignity of the subject, the itinerant venders of important intelligence, in our streets and market-places, after horrifying the listening crowd, with "the last speech, and dying declaration" of some wretch, hanged for murder; by way of farce, after tragedy, now favour us with "a full, true, and particular account of the great combat between the Rev. Mr. Stewart of Broughshane, and Priest Macaulay of Bally-mena; wherein is set forth, the difference between their two religions, by way of question and answer, all for one halfpenny!"

In addition to these blushing honours, sufficient to make any man vain, I observe, by the public prints, that "the inhabitants of Bally-mena, and its vicinity, have resolved to present you with a copy of a Polyglott Bible, and several critical works, which are calculated to explain and elucidate the same."

The people of Bally-mena, are not such dull fellows as is generally supposed. Under a stupid exterior, a rich fund of genuine humour, mingled with benevolence, lies concealed. Thus, having witnessed your deficiences on a late occasion, and willing to cover your retreat with a show of victory, and at the same time, to give you a gentle hint, as to your future line of study, they have agreed to supply you with books, of which you evidently stand much in need,—"a Polyglott Bible, and works calculated to explain and elucidate the same." And, if I am not greatly mistaken in the estimate I have formed of your character, you will gravely receive it as a compliment, and "pocket the affront!"

Now, all this idle bravadoing might fairly call up a smile on the gravest face, were it not for its probable effects. It has sown the seeds of bitterness and dissension, amongst numbers of ignorant people of both

denominations, who know nothing of the real merits of the question at issue; and these, in due time, will yield a plentiful harvest of malice, and hatred, and all uncharitableness. And these miserable consequences will doubtless remain, long after the unworthy cause of them shall have been forgotten, and your name, and your purposes, and your hopes, shall have perished from the earth.

I find that I have wandered from the subject with which I set out, the consideration of your proofs of "the essential divinity of our blessed Lord;" but your inconsistencies have led me into these deviations; and perhaps, in due time, I may yet, like yourself, return to the path of duty. You have raised the war-whoop of intolerance against your brethren, with whom you lately held intimate converse, *because they exercise their reason in matters of faith*,—and you have, almost in the same breath, denounced the poor ignorant Catholic, because he presumes *not to think for himself*, but with pious submission, receives the law from the mouth of his priest, and believes and worships as his fathers have done!

These are more contradictions, which I must leave you to reconcile; and again subscribe myself,

Yours faithfully,

August 17, 1827. VINDEX.

THE extraordinary proceedings of the General Synod of Ulster, at their late annual meeting, of which we have given as long and as accurate an account as possible, must have excited mingled sensations of gratitude and sorrow, in the mind of every sincere disciple of Jesus Christ. They must have called forth sorrow, if not indignation, that men assuming the name of Christian Ministers, and miscalling themselves Protestant Dissenters, should, by their conduct, have violated every principle of Protestanism, and set at nought, the distinctive benevolence of Christianity. At the same time, they must have elicited the purest gratitude to heaven, that not a few were there, who evinced their freedom from the leprosy of intolerance, who resolved to stand fast in that "liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free," nobly vindicated the privileges of humanity, and fearlessly incurred the odium of the fanatic, and the sarcasm of the bigot, whilst boldly advocating that intellectual privilege, characteristic of man, and the chartered right of the Christian—a privilege,

Unsung
By poets, and by senators unpraised,
Which monarchs cannot grant, nor all the powers,
Of earth and hell confederate, take away.

The meeting began well. It commenced with a discourse on Christian benevolence, by the late Moderator of the Synod. But Mr. Magill, fond, we presume, of striking contrasts, speedily broke up the harmony, which the practical exemplification of the principles of gospel charity would have produced, by introducing a motion which soon led to "most admired disorder." The idea of depriving a respected individual of the office of Clerk, simply for his opinions, for it was acknowledged on all sides, that Mr. Porter's conduct in the office was unimpeachable, was certainly worthy of the worst days of orthodoxy, and the language by which the motion was illustrated and adorned, was a most apt com-

ment on the spirit which dictated it. Let not Mr. Magill flatter himself, that the "people of India, Africa, and the South Seas," will fix "their eyes on the Synod of Ulster," or himself, with approbation. The approval of persons in their benighted and heathenish condition, may possibly be very gratifying to Mr. Magill, and truly his language, and his motion, and their admiration, would be very appropriately associated; but we think, that even these poor creatures, could they understand the subject, would turn from *such* Christianity with aversion and contempt. "High-way robber, and low-way robber!"—Poor man! Let him know that the parties whom he thus characterizes, believe all that they conceive the Scriptures teach them respecting the character, offices, and person of the Saviour, they value Christ's mission as the most glorious dispensation of God's mercy, and they rejoice in Jesus, as "the way, the truth, and the life." If they are mistaken in their opinions, they are to be pitied, not condemned; and he must know little of human nature, who imagines, that the erring will be led to truth by opprobious names. These, however, have ever been the chief weapons of those who think they "have all faith," and we envy them not their possession.

Mr. Magill, unfortunately, did not stand alone in the employment of rancorous and unmeaning abuse. This folly was shared pretty equally by several other individuals. The one who avowed "that Arians and Calvinists should not worship in the same temple, nor give each other the right hand of fellowship," for "in fact, they do not worship the same God," proved most abundantly, his title to rank high in the scale. Where can these men have lived—what society can they have kept—what works can they have studied? Surely these are not the teachings of that Bible in which they profess to believe; or the manifestations of that Spirit, by which they almost assert, they are illuminated.

The amendment which was carried, condemned Arianism, but retained Mr. Porter. This, however, was not sufficiently explicit for Mr. Cooke, whose exhibitions, during the meeting of Synod, formed the most extraordinary portion of their most extraordinary proceedings. Not satisfied with this sweeping reprobation of Arianism, Mr. Cooke followed it up, by proposing that the members should declare their belief in that portion of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, "There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory!" This motion, Mr. Cooke stated, he should, at a future period, follow up, by moving commissions of inquiry into the faith of ministers, suspending them from, and depriving them of their charges, and precluding persons from holding communion with those who differed from the Catechism in opinion! We must do Mr. Cooke the justice to say, that he goes boldly forward to the accomplishment of his end, and that end, divested of all cant and mystification, is, the establishment of an Inquisition in the Presbyterian Church of Ireland—its avowed and unattainable object, uniformity of faith! Of Mr. Cooke, we know nothing, but by the melancholy exhibition he made of himself at the Synod. The

charges brought against him in open Synod, and the truth of which he acknowledged, the bitter and malignant spirit all his speeches evince, his deplorable ignorance of the principles, which, with all the authority of infallibility, he anathematizes, the Procrustes propositions he brought, or will bring forward, all mark him out as the tool, or the leader of a party, who would bring back, if they had the power, those blissful periods of priestcraft, when the high behests of the minister were bowed to, as the dictation of God's Spirit,—when the laity had nothing to do, but to believe, or with the laws, but to obey them,—when the dungeon hushed objectors,—and the scaffold, or the stake, put a close to heresy! Unfortunately for Mr. Cooke and his adherents, they have been born out of due season. Their spirit is that of by-gone centuries; but they live in the 19th, and that makes all the difference. Mr. Cooke seems fond of sarcasm, and has perhaps read John Bunyan. If he has, he may possibly recollect his account of Pagan and Pope, who fixed themselves in the neighbourhood of the valley of the shadow of death, and most grievously annoyed the pilgrims, who, in the old time, passed through it; some of whom, fell victims to the accursed spirit by which Pope and Pagan were actuated, and whose bones lay bleaching in the winds of heaven, at the entrance to the unholy place, where once they dwelt. He may likewise remember, that as the story goes, Pagan was dead long long ago; and as to old Pope, though still in being, he was become so feeble and paralytic, that all he could do, was to sit at a distance, biting his nails, and grinning, and cursing the pilgrims, because they were out of the reach of his intolerance.

Mr. Cooke honoured us also with a portion of vituperation. The profundity of his research respecting the despatch and arrival of parcels—their directions and depository—was marvellous! "Amazing knowledge, vast and deep!" A fine subject truly, on which to harangue the Ministers and Elders of the North of Ireland! We thank him, however, for his *advertisement* of our Magazine, and at the same time pity the imbecility which marked his observations.

We are convinced our readers will have participated in the sincere pleasure we experienced, in the perusal of the speeches of the friends of Christian liberty, and especially that of Mr. Montgomery. It is truly a most eloquent tribute to the principles of pure and undefiled Religion. Even on the assembly to which it was addressed, it produced an effect for the time. That it was an evanescent feeling, must be attributed to other causes than those of argument and Scripture. We feel glad to record, that the leading remarks of Mr. Montgomery have been copied into almost every newspaper of character in Ireland; and that a separate edition of it has been published both in Dublin and Belfast, by the friends of Civil and Religious Liberty. This is as it should be. We cannot but regret, however, that its excellent author did not conclude it by a motion, embodying the great principles of Protestantism, and pledging the Synod to the Bible, and the Bible alone, as the standard of faith. Had this been done, the cloven foot of bigotry would have been more distinctly visible than even now it is; the

intolerants would have been shown forth as not deeming the Bible safe or sufficient, without the Westminster Catechism, and probably the scales of prejudice would thus have fallen from many an eye, that the cant of orthodoxy may now have hoodwinked. The division would then have been,—the Westminster Confession, or the Bible? On similar grounds, we would suggest, that the friends of intellectual freedom in Ireland, should no longer rest contented with the nickname of Arian, Socinian, or New-Light, but should adopt that which would be more strictly characteristic—BIBLE CHRISTIANS. Their opponents may, if they choose, still retain their name of Calvinist, Old-Light, Westminster Catechists, or Cookites!

We were disappointed in the conduct of one individual. We had read, and read with delight, his admirable sermon delivered before the Synod in 1826; and we were prepared to expect, that he, though a Calvinist, would have been foremost in opposition to any test being imposed on his brethren, and would have spurned the mental fetters, by whomsoever forged. We have been mistaken. We grant, that the Rev. J. Carlile of Dublin did *speak* against tests of faith, but he *voted* for the declaration; and for ourselves, we can see no difference in point of principle, between men being required to *sign* a test of faith, and their being called on to *declare* their belief in it. The imposition of the test is the atrocity. It is the setting up of a merely human standard of belief—it is substituting the Westminster Catechism, for the Bible, that we protest against. Mr. Carlile, in the sermon we have alluded to, plainly stated, that there were differences amongst the members of the Synod; and the concluding sentence of the portion we shall quote, has unfortunately proved prophetic.

"It is matter of public notoriety, that we have amongst us, as a body, diversities of opinion respecting various parts of the Christian system, and some of them, as I conceive, of vital importance. And I confess, that, although my own opinions are as perhaps as fixed and as determinate as those of any of my brethren, it appears to me to be one of the peculiar beauties of our modification of Presbyterianism, that men may hold, and may express, different opinions amongst us, without exposing themselves to any attempts being made to injure them in their pecuniary interests. I shall probably carry along with me but a small proportion of the Christian public, when I exult in the liberty that we enjoy of declaring our sentiments unreservedly on all subjects, without any other apprehension than that of being convinced of error; and when I declare it to be the conviction of my deliberate judgment, that the compulsory measures that have been invented and employed by various ecclesiastical bodies, for securing uniformity of doctrine, have increased the evil which they were intended, and I doubt not honestly intended, to prevent. They have merely imposed silence on those who have held opinions different from the opinions of the majority; and have thus, by preventing them from expressing their opinions freely and publicly, and thus furnishing opportunities of examining them by the light of the Scriptures, driven them to propagate them in private, by hints, and insinua-

tions, and sarcasms, and that too with a zeal proportioned to the restraints laid upon the public avowal of them. And these compulsory measures have farther prevented many of those who were subjected to them, from forming any settled judgment on subjects, the first aspect of which seemed to be unfavourable to the dominant opinions; and have induced them, rather to profess to believe as their church believes, without examination, than to bring themselves into the dilemma of either doing violence to their consciences by professing to believe doctrines, which, after investigation, they had found they could not believe, or to sacrifice their temporal interests. And thus errors, which, had they been brought to the surface by every encouragement held out to the free expression of them, might have been cured there, have, by this injudicious treatment, been thrown inward, to prey on the vitals of the system; and perhaps *have left to that ecclesiastical body nothing but the lifeless carcase of a church, labelled with an orthodox creed.*"

Our readers may well inquire the cause of these contentions, especially that relating to Mr. Porter. We think the following brief summary, by George Ensor, the enlightened author of various admirable works, is pretty descriptive of the governing motive:

"The Academical Institution of Belfast, was intended to educate the Presbyterian ministers of Ireland. For some time, it obtained a *Regium Donum* of £1500 a-year. Government then required a stronger hold on its management. The negociators on the part of the Institution, were very conciliating—yet not enough so; and the ministerial chapmen declared it was no bargain. The market was opened again. Mr. Peel resisted, though vetos and interference were proposed,—and with an anti-Irish insolence, characteristic of many Englishmen, he suggested that the Presbyterians might go to Scotland to be educated; and he would have sent them to his dear Oxford, if Church and State, like the janitors of Erebus, had not shut that sanctuary against all Dissenters. In this situation, it was proposed, that the Commissioners of Education in Ireland, should inquire into the merits and wants of the Belfast Institution. In due time, the Commissioners, whose motto is *festina lente*, did inquire; and some of these Commissioners, being right religious men, and fraught with theology and queries, began some pithy disquisitions on doctrinals. How superhuman is the faith of Church and State, when the civil Commissioners, under their auspices, act as nursing-mothers and grand-dams, to conserve orthodoxy among the Presbyterians of Ulster! Mark the consequences: the want of a *Regium Donum*, or annuity of a few hundreds, induced this inquiry; and out of the evidence before the inquisitors, arose the angry and contentious spirit in the Synod. The fact is obvious, and it is so reported by the speakers themselves. One said, "we have, to be sure, long agreed on minor matters; but we have kept the *doctrines* out of sight, lest we should bring shame on ourselves!" Another gentleman is still more explicit. "It was the first time he had ever heard of a body dead to its reputation and character; for we ought to use our best endeavours to stand well in the opinion of Government, from which we receive so great support! Indeed,

of late years, Government has paid more than ordinary attention to this body; and perhaps the examination of our Clerk, was in consequence of its anxiety to become better acquainted with us!" Here we have the supposed views and objects of the parties; yet, who believes that the English Government cares one atom whether the Synod of Ulster is Trinitarian or Arian? They know, that Presbyterians and Seceders cannot be friendly to Prelacy; and it can be no object, truly, to an episcopal government, whether the Presbytery of Antrim be increased, by reducing the Synod of Ulster."

Yes, we believe it *is* the *Regium Donum* which lies at the foundation of these disputes. We believe that our Lord and Master intended his religion to be totally independent of the Civil power. We think that whenever Christianity becomes connected with the State, its purity is sullied, and its nature perverted. But we have special reasons against the *Regium Donum* granted to the Presbyterians of Ireland. Its origin was bad, and its subsequent progress has been worthy its commencement. £600 a-year, was first given by Charles II., under the head of "*secret service money.*" It was gradually increased, till in 1784, it amounted to £2600, and the terms of the grant were, "for his *Majesty's service*, and the good of the kingdom." The bounty or the bribe, as we deem it, was increased in 1803, and still continues, to £14970 : 18 : 10. The money is distributed in three classes, arranged according to the amount which the several Congregations subscribe as stipend to their Ministers. Those who raise the smallest sum, obtain £50, the next class £75, and the highest and richest societies have £100 per annum. If the object were strictly benevolent, we apprehend, this classification would be reversed; but if the intention were to procure good service to the *State*, and putting religion wholly out of consideration, certainly the present scheme appears most feasible. That the State is satisfied with the effects which its bounty has produced, we may conclude, on the authority of Mr. now Lord Plunket: "Some fifty years ago," observes his Lordship, "the Protestant Church of Ireland was much alarmed about the Presbyterians. They were considered all deadly enemies. What was done? The laws which imposed tests on the Presbyterians were repealed, and a *provision* was made for the Presbyterian Clergy. What was the consequence? Have the Protestant clergy of Ireland any better friends than the Presbyterians? None. We hear of no points of contention between them. In many parts of the North of Ireland, the people do not care to which church they go. It depends upon which has the best preacher; and they live in the most perfect harmony together." How those ministers to whom this description is applicable, for there are many highly honourable exceptions, will relish this compliment of the influence of government money upon their minds and conduct, at the expense of their principles and consistency, we know not; but we do know, that the reception of that grant is in direct opposition to all the grounds of rational Protestant Dissent. We are aware that it is contended, that if the *Regium Donum* were refused,

many Societies in the North of Ireland could not support a minister. We are prepared for the alternative. Better far, that these Congregations should expire, than that those principles of liberty on which they were founded, should be sold for a mess of pottage. But surely this might be prevented, by the wealthier congregations contributing to the support of their poorer brethren. At any rate, this forms not the shadow of an excuse for the richer places receiving the "thirty pieces of silver." That truly excellent man Dr. Richard Price, has exactly expressed our opinions on this subject. We feel pleasure in quoting the fact. "Being once applied to for his vote by the late Sir Edmund Thomas, when canvassing for the county of Glamorgan, and being offered that worthy baronet's interest to procure him the disposal of the *Regium Donum* among his brethren, Mr. Price immediately replied, that the best service Sir Edmund could render to him or his brethren, would be, to advise the King's ministers to discontinue a donation, which could only be regarded by every independent Dissenter, as the *price of his liberty.*"

As Christians, and Protestant Dissenters, we protest against this alliance of Meeting-house or Chapel and the State; as inhabitants of Great Britain, we object to this distribution of the national money. Let those who want Government help, join their Episcopalian brethren. If Scripture and reason be too powerful to allow of their doing that, let them be consistent, practical Dissenters. When inculcating the principles of Christian liberty on the minds of their hearers, let no visions of *Regium Donum* check the hallowed aspiration unto freedom. Indifference to God's truth would soon disappear, if pecuniary chains were cast away. To accept the boon, and yet to be protesters against Church and State alliances, is weak, if not criminal. It would be sufficient to silence our advocacy of Protestant Dissent, could any one with truth say to us, You yearly receive a portion of the *Regium Donum.*

The meeting at Strabane is another illustration of the pernicious effects of ecclesiastical authority. When men are embodied in corporations, whether civil or religious, they too frequently are guilty of conduct, of which in their individual capacities they would be ashamed. We appeal to the testimony of history, whether Councils, Assemblies, Synods, ever yet were productive of good to the Church of Christ? They have made hypocrites of the fearful, and martyrs of the firm—they have corrupted Heaven's revelation, and destroyed human rights—they have dethroned Jesus, and usurped the prerogatives of the Almighty; but never have they established intellectual freedom, promoted man's improvement, or disseminated pure and undefiled Religion. The Synod of Ulster forms, we apprehend, no exception. Its late proceedings, especially, have only added another proof to the validity of the remark of John Milton, that "*New Presbyter* is but OLD PRIEST writ large!"

Whilst such are our opinions respecting the conduct of all ecclesiastical bodies, and of the Synod of Ulster, taken collectively, still we congratulate our friends, as we hope we may call them,

who made the noble and courageous and Christian stand, against the bigotry, selfishness, and intolerance of its leading members. We rejoice in the talent, eloquence, and sound Christian principle which were so ably displayed. The excitement the discussion has produced, must be favourable to free inquiry and Scriptural investigation. Truth will be the gainer. Consistency and firmness and perseverance, are alone necessary to ensure its progress. But these qualities are essential. Timidity, evasion, accommodation to popular prejudices, will retard, as far as the errors or vices of man can do so, the onward march of knowledge, liberty, and uncorrupted Christianity. Well was it said, in 1766, by JOHN NELSON of Ballykelly, in language worthy to be remembered—worthy to be acted upon,—

"The liberty of examining our principles, and of professing our faith and hope, without danger of imprisonment or murder, we generally agree to extol in words. But is not even this choice gift of heaven perfectly insignificant, unless we make a discreet use of it? With regard to all the purposes of social improvement, might we not live as profitably in Portugal, trembling under the terrors of the Inquisition, as in Ireland, if the inconveniences that attend our acquiring and publishing the truth, are sufficient to make us slothful or silent? In every country, no doubt, the truth will always excite the resentment of those men whose principles or pursuits cannot bear its piercing eye; while an easy compliance with their views will alone secure their friendship; but whatever opinion the world may entertain of that left-handed wisdom which usurps the name of prudence, or whatever apparent advantages it may bring along with it, yet, it is only by despising and violating its wretched maxims, that ignorance can be banished, error detected, or truth propagated."

The Rev. John Hincks, has been appointed Minister of Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool.

Mr. Talbot, who has just completed his preparatory studies for the ministry, at York College, has accepted the invitation of the Society of Unitarian Christians at Tenterden in Kent, to become the Colleague of their respected and venerable Pastor, the Rev. L. Holden.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 14. October, 1827. Vol. II.

Extracts from a Manuscript Address to a Clergyman holding Calvinistic sentiments.—No. 2.

(Continued from page 12.)

But another most momentous question arises out of the above futile attempts, as they appear to me, to reconcile manifest incongruities, viz. whether by dividing the *Godhead*, as you term it, into three persons, and maintaining that they are each of them God, you do not contradict that other great and fundamental truth, so continually inculcated in the Scriptures, that there exists only one God, "*one Jehovah, one God and Father of all.*" This, you must know, is the doctrine every where throughout the Bible, maintained in opposition to the figments of heathen idolatry. May I entreat you, Sir, who I believe to entertain a profound reverence for our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and, consequently, to be ready to bow implicitly to every word which fell from his lips, to turn your attention particularly to what he has said and taught upon this subject. What does he deliver as "*the first and great commandment?*" It is no other than a complete, most distinct, and emphatic recognition of the doctrine of one only God;—and, if the plainest and most solemn declarations mean what they assert, excludes the idea that more than one person can be entitled to that appellation, or to share in the devotion which is due to him only. Observe the energy with which the Lord Jesus announces this great, all-comprehensive, all-commanding principle. "The first of all the commandments, is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."* This, Sir, with the following context, to verse 34, is highly deserving of the most serious and attentive consideration of yourself, and of every person who so warmly advocates the doctrine of three persons, who are each of them God,

* Mark xii. 29, 30.

as to exclude from the list of their Christian brethren, and in the terms of your Athanasian creed, consign to everlasting perdition, all those who adhere to the plain sense of this commandment. If Jesus was himself the Almighty, would he, when thus explicitly called upon to declare the great fundamental principle of religion and virtue, have used language, which, to those whom he was addressing, must have totally excluded the idea, that there was any plurality of persons in the Deity? As they did not acknowledge him as the Christ, or anointed of God, and certainly did not dream of his being Deity itself, it is absolutely certain, that this declaration could not have conveyed to them the most distant idea, that he himself was identified with Jehovah: it could have imparted no other conception to their minds, than that Jehovah is strictly and immutably one, and, consequently, that all devotion, all religious affection, must be confined to him, to the exclusion of Jesus, in common with all other beings and persons whatsoever. We have an instance, in which Jesus brings himself into an immediate comparison with God: does he there represent himself as equal to, or identified with him? "There came one running and kneeling to him, and asked him, Good Master, what shall I do, that I may inherit eternal life? Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God."—Mark x. 17, 18. If Jesus was Jehovah, the epithet good Master, was surely too low, clearly showing, that the addresser had no adequate conception of his infinite greatness; nor, indeed, does it appear by any means more than commensurate to express his character, as the anointed of God. But the answer of Jesus, is eminently expressive of that devotion and humility, which uniformly prompted him to refer all his powers, and even all his personal merits to the Supreme Being. But, Sir, could any language more strongly express that he was *not* the Supreme Being, but his humble worshipper and servant? and that all the beneficence which manifested itself throughout his ministry and life, was to be ascribed primarily not to him, but to the God by whom he was commissioned? How admirably instructive is this language, regarded as a pattern of self-abasement and pure piety, for our imitation! How abhorrent from the notion that he claimed for himself the prerogatives of Omnipotence! Do you assert, that the words "why callest thou me good," relate simply to his

human nature? Consider, Sir, whether the address was not *intended* to convey the clear and admirable sentiments which it must convey, to the uninitiated in the doctrine of two natures united in the person of Christ? Could the person addressed, have the most distant idea of such a doctrine? and could Jesus, whose general language is not that of scholastic sophistry, but of manly plainness, and great simplicity, have intended to practise deception on a subject, in which his own honour and greatness were so intimately concerned? Another important consideration, is, what instructions the Lord Jesus gave with respect to prayer, and what was his own practice in the exercise of this solemn duty. Did he give any directions for the worship of a Trinity of persons, or of himself in particular, as the second person in the Godhead? "When ye pray, say, *Our Father who art in heaven.*"* "In that day, *ye shall ask me nothing;* whatsoever ye shall *ask the Father in my name,* he will give it you."† Here are plain directions to worship the Father, and to present petitions to him in the name of Christ, and a plain prohibition from offering any petitions immediately to him. How, Sir, is this reconcileable with your practice of offering prayers to "the Holy and ever-blessed Trinity, three persons in one God," or to "God the Son," and "God the Holy Ghost?" Or what other directions will you point out in the language of Jesus, or of any other scriptural character, for prayers of this description? The Scriptures cannot, and do not contain contradictory instructions upon this great subject; they are uniform in directing all devotions to be offered to "the One Jehovah," "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."‡ How, then, can you be justified in the adoption of objects of prayer, so different from the plain purport of Christ's instructions, and in condemning those, who, in strict conformity with them, offer their prayers to the one God and Father only, in the name of Jesus Christ? What, again, was the practice of the Lord Jesus in the exercise of prayer? Does he adopt any distinction of persons or natures in his addresses to Deity? Do we find any instances of the human nature of Christ, addressing his divine nature, under the appellation of God the Son? Nothing like it;—having resisted every temptation to a different practice, by quoting the

---

* Luke xi. 2. † John xvi. 23. ‡ Rom. xv. 6. in the original.

ancient Scripture,—"It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." He exhibited an example of the strictest adherence to this principle;—"He lifted up his eyes to heaven and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth," &c.* "He fell on his face and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt."† Regard, Sir, with the eye of your mind, this grateful worshipper,—this most meek and lowly supplicant, before "the throne of the heavenly grace," and ask yourself, whether there be any thing monstrously perverse and wicked,—any thing deserving of those unutterable torments, to which heretics are consigned by those of your persuasion, in concluding that he was really no other than he so manifestly appeared to be,—and that he was supplicating the Father only, and *not himself?* Whether it be not very possible, that in deviating from plain Scripture and reason, you have deviated from the truth; and that those whom you condemn, may be not only sincere, but perfectly correct, in embracing a conclusion, which appears so palpably evident? Whether their adherence to it, though opposed by numbers, by worldly power and influence, and by the threats of future woe, afford not some proof, that they really value "the word of truth," at least as highly as some others, who boast their evangelical purity and holiness? And whether their opinion, that all involuntary error, though on subjects, like those before us, of primary importance, is venial in the sight of God, be not more congenial with his attributes, than that to deny a trinity of persons in his essence, is to incur his everlasting displeasure? The Unitarian, Sir, believes the strict unity of God, to be the great first principle of true religion; but he, nevertheless, thinks, that many conscientious and truly pious and good men, have maintained the doctrine of the Trinity, and other tenets which he believes to be gross error; and all such characters, are, he believes, objects of the divine approbation and blessing; their dispositions and actions, and not their speculative opinions and professions, determining his treatment of them. Thus, their sentiments are productive of a candour and charity, to which rigid "Orthodoxy" is an utter stranger. And will any Christian deny,

---

* Matth. xi. 25. † Matth. xx. 39.

that candour and charity are more congenial with the mild dictates of reason, and the benign spirit of Christianity, than that bitterness of spirit, which first fixing the standard of Orthodoxy, sentences all who do not conform to this standard, to "perish everlastingly?" Consider, Sir, whether this flagrant departure from the pure spirit, as well as the plain doctrine of the New Testament, should not seal *its* condemnation, as one of the most dangerous adversaries of true religion and goodness with which it hath to encounter?

(To be Continued.)

The importance of Truth, and the necessity of its avowal.

That truth universally is of importance, every person of reflection will readily admit. And as moral truth is conducive to the peace and harmony of society, by the maintenance of a proper understanding between man and man in the various concerns of life; so, scientific truth, by affording a correct knowledge of the arts and sciences, contributes to human comfort and happiness. How important, then, must be divine truth—that truth which came from heaven to enlighten and save a world! Every other thing sinks into insignificance, when compared with heaven's best boon to sinful man, the gospel of eternal life! It enlightens his mind, reforms his heart, increases his happiness, and inspires him with the cheering hope of a happy existence beyond the grave. "Here we can read our title clear to mansions in the skies." Jesus, by his own resurrection, hath conquered the power of death, destroyed the terrors of the tomb, and opened to the believer's view the glories of immortality.

As the religion of Jesus Christ has suffered much from the hand of corruption, which was even lifted up against it during the first stages of its existence, we should be very cautious from what source we derive our religious opinions. The fountain may be clear though the streams are muddy. The enlightened and consistent inquirer neglects the winding and insignificant stream, which becomes more impure the farther it runs onward in its course, as incapable of affording him any real refreshment; and proceeds at once to the fountain's head, and there drinks freely the pure waters of eternal life. To the Bible, then, and to the Bible only, should we go for divine truth. Convinced of its vast importance, we should "search the Scriptures,"

"judge of ourselves what is right," and whilst we "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." If we have a just regard for the interests of religious truth, and feel its power on the mind, we shall not be led to acquiesce in any opinions, without examination. The most popular notions are not always the most correct; indeed, they have generally been otherwise. Yet the majority of mankind, are far from being convinced of the supreme importance of divine truth, and, consequently, remain indifferent to the restoration of its purity, and to the promotion of its influence.

Unitarian Christians, who have been compelled by the force of truth, to embrace an unpopular faith, must naturally consider their own opinions of the highest importance. To suppose otherwise, would imply not only an inconsistency of character, but extreme indifference, if not a dereliction of religious principle. The doctrine of one God the Father, and that he only is the proper object of religious worship, is of paramount importance in the Christian scheme. He who has embraced this fundamental truth from conviction, and cherishes in his own breast, its heavenly influences, cannot view it in any other light. It is the essence of his religion, the very foundation of his creed. When connected with the paternity of the Creator, and the divine mission of the Saviour, it comprehends every thing that can elevate the mind, and warm the heart. Such a religion is Unitarianism. It is to us the truth of heaven, and was proclaimed by Jesus the Son of God.

Can Unitarianism, which we consider to be identical with divine truth, be viewed by its professors, as of trifling importance? No: this seems morally impossible. Is it not, then, the duty of every Unitarian, to do all that lies within his power, to disseminate his opinions in the world? Do we not believe that our revered Master was himself a Unitarian, a worshipper of the one God the Father, and a proclaimer of his universal benevolence? Then we are bound as his professed disciples, to follow his example, to do all the good we can in our day and generation, by the promotion of virtue, piety, and religion.

It must, however, be acknowledged, that there are many who are convinced of the truth of Unitarian sentiments, yet have not sufficient fortitude of mind to avow them. Some are deterred from making a public avowal, on account of family connexions: others, from the loss which they might in consequence sustain in business, and various incidental circumstances that might follow. These are

certainly very formidable disadvantages; but we apprehend they are much fewer in the present day, than in the days of our ancestors; or, indeed, than they were in the latter part of the last century. But these things, powerful as is their influence, are not sufficient to deter the independent mind that is impressed with the importance of truth, from making an honest and open avowal of its convictions. We lament the inconsistency and want of Christian fortitude of those, who are afraid the world should know their religious opinions. It seems a reservation that is scarcely consonant with religious integrity. It savours too much of the old maxim, "to think with the wise, but to act with the vulgar." But suppose the disadvantages of making an open profession of Unitarianism are great, the question is, not what is our convenience or worldly interest, but *what is our duty?* Are we to act according to the dictates of conscience? or, on the contrary, to stifle our convictions, whenever they differ from the popular opinion? "Whosoever (says Jesus) is ashamed of me before men, of him will I be ashamed before my Father who is in heaven." From such conduct, Jesus and his Apostles would have shrunk. The great Reformer of the world, made no compromise with error, but boldly and unequivocally taught the doctrines of divine truth. He was at the head of "a sect which was every where spoken against." Though persecuted by the powers of the world, he withstood all the insults to which he was exposed, with an honest firmness; for "guile was not found in his mouth." When Peter and John were arraigned before the Jewish rulers, for having miraculously performed a cure on a lame man, they were commanded not to speak, or teach in the name of Jesus. But the Apostles inspired with a love of truth and its fearless avowal, "answered and said, Whether it be right in the sight of God, to hearken unto you, more than unto God, judge ye; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Our duty, then, is clear, if we take Jesus and his Apostles for our example. Neither he nor they, ever shrunk from an avowal of the truth. It was, indeed, one of the principal objects of the Saviour's mission, to bear witness to the truth, which he did, by exemplifying it in his life, and confirming it by his death. To have practised mental reservation—to have said one thing and meant another, would have been beneath the character of him, who was "the way, the truth, and the life."

Besides, what is there in the researches of the sincere inquirer after divine truth, at the avowal of which, he need be ashamed? Is he impartial in his inquiries, and honest in his convictions? Has he used his best means to discover truth, and prepared his mind for its reception? Then he need not be afraid to make an open profession of his opinions, which, should they be erroneous, would reflect on him no disgrace. In fact, it would be an honour, rather than a disgrace, for what he did receive, was from conviction, and cherished it as truth in an honest heart.

It is from a want of serious reflection, and strict religious integrity, that so many persons, who appear persuaded of the truth of Unitarian sentiments, continue to attend Trinitarian worship. This is a gross and manifest inconsistency. For if there be one truth in religion of more importance than another, it is that which regards the object of worship. A conscientious Unitarian, must view the worship of the Trinity, as derogatory to the attributes of that God "*who knoweth no other;*" who *only hath life and immortality in himself.* Nay, a Unitarian cannot join in Trinitarian worship, without incurring the crime of *Idolatry*, because he pays that homage to Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, *under the conviction* that it is due *only* to the *supreme Jehovah.* We do not mean to assert, that Trinitarians themselves are idolators, for they *believe* that each of the three persons of their Trinity, is individually and distinctly God; and, consequently, the rightful object of religious worship. This inconsistency of conduct, must arise in some degree, from a want of religious feeling. It seems almost impossible, that a person fully persuaded of the truth of Unitarian Christianity, and who feels its consoling influence on the mind, can unite, without remorse of conscience, in the most sacred of all exercises, with those of his fellow Christians, who worship a Trinity; Unitarian worship is so peculiarly calculated to refine and expand the intellectual powers, to inspire the mind with animating and exalted views of the Almighty Father, and to impart the purest consolation to the heart. Those, then, that are convinced of its truth, should evince their sincerity by a corresponding practice; to speak the truth in love, regardless of the consequences of its avowal, and to unite with the believers of the primitive faith, in the adoration of the great Author of nature, the God of Jesus and the Father of mankind.

U. M.

The Teachings of Nature and Orthodoxy contrasted.

(Continued from page 4.)

THE contemplation of the heavenly bodies unfolds far different views of the magnitude of the works of God, than are derivable from an examination of the terrestrial creation. Paley is probably correct in stating, that though "not the best medium through which to prove the agency of an intelligent Creator, yet, this being proved, they show, beyond all other objects, the magnificence of his operations, and raise the mind to sublimer views of the Deity than any other subject affords." Thus, when we recollect, that those stars which are perceptible to the naked eye, are but a small part of what man has been able to discover; that the faint glimmer of the Galaxy is produced by the blended rays of groups and clusters of stars, to define whose extent exceeds human capabability; that by the assistance of art, numbers of luminous bodies have been discovered; and that every progressive improvement, every increase of power of which we gain possession, introduces more and more to our knowledge,—we conclude it probable, that all space is thus filled by bodies, to affix imaginary bounds to which, exceeds our utmost range of thought. But then arises the question, were they created with any reference to the physical situation of man? Was the milky-way stretched across the heavens merely to embellish his dwelling? Were the stars created for his use—to please him by their lustre, or benefit him by their light, many of which he cannot behold without the assistance of a telescope, and whose number he is unable to ascertain?

So far from being created solely for the use or pleasure of man, the conclusion is rational, that the stars which stud the firmament, extending far beyond the limits of vision natural or artificial, and roaming through endless space, are in reality luminaries similar to the central one of our own system, and which dispenses light and heat to revolving planets; the whole being governed by those general and invariable laws to which we are ourselves subject.

This is a view of omnipotent exertion far more consonant with the attributes of an uncaused Cause, than that which limits his works to a mere point in space. Here we are led to contemplate that immensity of power, which called these bodies into existence, allotted their several

stations, and imparted that regularity of motion, the producer of successive times and seasons. We reflect on the almighty energy exerted to give them those amazing impulses, which enable them to maintain their prodigious celerity without hinderance, without being retarded in their journies, or manifesting the least deviation from their prescribed courses. We conceive of countless numbers of stars, as of various points, around which move thousands and millions of planetary worlds, some probably revolving in the vast expanse with accelerated velocities, while, with respect to ourselves, others may proceed with less rapidity; that these systems of worlds complete their various orbits, without invading any foreign spheres of influence and attraction, to accomplish which, they are placed at most immense distances from each other, and that probably they have been performing their circuits from all eternity, or, at any rate, from a period of time the duration of which the mind cannot comprehend;* and that

* Objections to such expansive delineations of creation, are occasionally advanced by steady textuaries, pre-determined to explain literally every passage which they find in the Bible; and who, therefore, amongst many other things equally clear, pertinaciously advocate as a doctrine of inspiration, consequently essential to salvation, the cosmogony of Moses, who, according to the account which bears his name, reduces the age of the world, and of all creation, to less than 6000 years.

To this, let it be again replied, that the Messengers and Prophets of God, had more important missions than simply to give mankind a few lessons in natural philosophy; that they spoke to men in current language, and alluded to prevalent opinions in support of their arguments, without stopping to inquire whether those opinions were strictly true. Nor is it material, whether Moses was literally correct or not, in his narratives of the creation. Those narratives could not be furnished by contemporaries of the event. They may rather be viewed as the floating traditions gathered together by him. But of the age of the world, he affords no evidence. "*In the beginning*" is a sentence as vague and indefinite, with respect to time, as could possibly be penned; and that *beginning* may be 60, or 600, or 600,000 years ago, for any proof which Moses affords to the contrary. He describes, not an original creation of the earth from nothing, but its renovation from chaotic confusion, the probable wreck of a former scene of animation, to its present order, constitution, and arrangement. It was rather a re-modification, a re-organization, than a new creation. Thus, the present state of things, the *world*, in contradistinction to the *earth*, cannot boast an antiquity of 6000 years, whilst its frame-work, its matter, its primary atoms or particles, may date their origin from a period long antecedent. This, *Cavier* and other natural philosophers, have endeavoured to prove from now existing appearances. And this view of the subject will account for all those fossil remains and marine strata, which well-meaning theologians, but unsound geologists, have vainly attempted to ascribe to the effects of the Deluge, and which sceptics and unbelievers have triumphantly adduced, as a sufficient apology for those sneers and sarcasms against Revelation, in which they have indecorously indulged.

they continue to exist and to revolve, as long as the Almighty wills them to be, and the all-powerful arm of Omnipotence is stretched out for their support—of Him who is the first and the last, whose hand hath laid the foundations of the earth, and whose right hand hath spanned the heavens.

It is, farther, a reasonable conclusion, that every created world is adapted to, and fitted for, the support of animated existence—is peopled with living beings, with creatures depending on the great Father of all for preservation and support, and who receive from his beneficent hand, favours, mercies, blessings.

This conclusion is derived from analogy. If we believe that God is omniscient, we must admit that some definite object was to be accomplished in every thing created; in other words, that nothing was created in vain. As far as our experience leads us, upon this earth we find this evidently the case. The earth is formed for the support of, and is peopled with, living beings. We discover other immense globes, which we have every reason to believe are similar to our own, traversing space, and we infer that these likewise are inhabited. We find upon our own earth an infinite gradation. From unorganized matter we proceed, step by step, and link by link, until we perceive traces of animal life; thence ascending the scale of existence, by imperceptible degrees, we arrive at *man*. Here we apparently stop. But do we hence suppose that here creation ceases?—that there are no intermediate orders of beings between man and that Infinite Mind, who is the origin of all, the One Supreme?—that that wide, that vast immensity remains unoccupied, unapplied? Avaunt the degrading thought.

Looking beneath us, we find in every spot, creation—the power of the Almighty every where visible. We perceive an infinite variety even in this fraction of creative power. We discover life in every place. The polar snows are not destitute, and the burning plains of the tropics swarm with existence. The most minute grain of sand is inhabited. A drop of water hanging at a needle's point, can boast its multitudes. And must we—can we—suppose, that all above us is not alike full? that the agency of Divine power is circumscribed to our earth alone? No. The immensity of creation is interminable. That Almighty God whom the heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain, He created the Universe. Systems upon

systems of worlds, all peopled with different orders of beings, probably varying in corporeal mechanism, as well as in intellectual rank and capabilities; but all obedient, all subject to the power of Jehovah, by whose fiat they were created, who spake the word and they existed.

Here, then, let the Christian take his stand, and view the works of the greatest and the best of beings—of his Creator and his Father. In the vast contemplation, his imagination will confess her feebleness; his most vivid conceptions will not be commensurate with the extent of their object, inasmuch, as finite minds cannot embrace infinite operations, nor limited powers fully comprehend unbounded attributes.

"Come, then, expressive silence, muse his praise."

(To be Continued.)

REVIEW.

The State of Society in the Age of Homer. By William Bruce, D. D. Belfast.—Hunter, London.

This is an interesting and useful work, and comprises a great deal of information in a little compass. The introduction contains remarks on the age of Homer and Hesiod, on the apparent imitations of Scripture by Homer, on the lives of Homer and Hesiod, and on the poetry of Homer. Our author is of opinion, that the life of Homer attributed to Herodotus, is genuine, there being no assignable motive for fraud. He adduces many strong arguments to show, that Homer copied from Hesiod, and not the latter from the former. There are comparisons of passages of Scripture with the Iliad, from which it appears probable, that Homer must have been acquainted with some of the books of the Old Testament. As he lived one hundred years after Solomon, he may have had access to the sacred records as far down as the first book of Kings. An extraordinary coincidence is found in the Eleventh Iliad, with Genesis ix. 13, unless we suppose Homer to have seen the first book of Moses: "Jupiter fixed the rainbow in the cloud, as a sign to mortal men."—*Homer.* "I have set my rainbow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth."—*Genesis.*

Section First contains remarks on Astronomy and Chron-

ology. Geography and Navigation occupy the Second Section. Wonderful, indeed, have been the discoveries and improvements in these sciences, since the time of Homer. A new world has been found, on which, in the time of Homer, the foot of man had not trodden. What a contrast between the Grecian ships, which were hauled on the coast of Troy, and a fleet composed of British men-of-war!

Section Third comprises an interesting account of the state of Agriculture. Stern necessity compelled mankind to direct their attention to the cultivation of the soil, and they soon discovered the means of rendering it productive. Rural occupations engaged the thoughts, and employed the hands of princes. They esteemed it no disgrace to descend to hard manual labour, and to perform what modern refinement terms menial offices. Ulysses found his father working in the orchard. We insert the passage from Pope's translation:

> But all alone the hoary king he found;
> His habit coarse, but warmly wrapp'd around
> His head that bow'd with many a pensive care,
> Fenced with a double cap of goatskin hair;
> His buskins old, in former service torn,
> But well repair'd; and gloves against the thorn.
> In this array the kingly gardener stood,
> And clear'd a plant, encumber'd with its wood.

Section Fourth, on Civil government, Military affairs, and Religion. "The patriarchal state was the original condition of mankind. The primitive stock speedily split into kindred tribes: the patriarch of a tribe soon passed into a king; and, accordingly, historians are agreed that monarchy was the first form of government. When clans became numerous, contentions ensued, and the stronger party obliged the weaker to seek for settlements where they could have more room." But the power of the kings was very limited. Indeed the sarcastic language of Thersites, the bold and insolent manner in which he was accustomed to assail the leaders of the Grecian army, manifests the prevalence of a democratic spirit. The most important office of a king, was that of a commander-in-chief. He led his subjects to battle, and engaged in the thickest of the fight. Another duty of kings, was to administer justice; but he was assisted by judges in the execution of this office. The following description of a sacrifice, will not, we think, be unacceptable to our readers: "It was celebrated by Nestor on the arrival of Telema-

chus. Having sent to the ship for the attendants of his guest, and to the field for an ox, and ordered the maid-servants to prepare the entertainment within, Nestor proceeded to the sacrifice. The assistants were all ready; the ox came from the field; the crew arrived from the ship; and the goldsmith attended with his implements of brass, a small anvil, a hammer, and forceps. Nestor furnished the gold; and the goldsmith having prepared it, applied it to the horns. Two attendants led the ox; another came from the house, bringing water for washing their hands, in a basin covered with flowers: in the other hand he held the saltcakes: a fourth, his own son, was prepared with a sharp axe to kill the ox; and a fifth held a vessel to receive the blood. Nestor began the ceremony by presenting the water and the sacred cakes, offering prayers to Minerva, cutting the hair from the head of the victim, and throwing it into the fire. After they had prayed, and presented the barley cakes, the son of Nestor struck the victim on the neck, and cut through the tendons. The ox fell, and all the women of the family raised a shout. The men lifted up the carcase from the ground, held it up, and drew back its head, till one of their chief men cut its throat. They then proceeded to strip off the hide, and cut the carcase asunder. They cut out the thighs, and rolled them in fat, and upon these they laid other pieces, which they sprinkled with meal and wine. Nestor applied fire to the billets of cleft-wood, and poured wine on the whole. The young men stood beside him holding five-pronged forks. After the thighs were consumed, and they had tasted the entrails, they cut the remainder into small pieces, fixed them on spits, and roasted them at the fire. When the youngest of Nestor's daughters had bathed and dressed Telemachus, Nestor took his seat, with his young friend beside him; and they partook of an entertainment, consisting of roasted flesh and wine, which was served by the principal servants. They had also a custom of cutting out the tongues of the victims, and burning them; offering, at the same time, libations of wine to the gods, before they retired to rest."

Section Fifth gives an account of private life and manners. At their entertainments, the hosts performed many of the menial offices. Thus, at the feast given by Achilles to the deputies from the fleet, Patroclus, the friend of Achilles, placed the pot on the fire, and put in the meat which

Achilles cut up. Having neither knives nor forks, they washed their hands before and after meals, a servant always attending with water and napkins. Their tables were wiped with sponges after eating. King's daughters used to wash their own clothes. They carried them out to the wells, and trampled the clothes with their feet in holes or cisterns full of water, and when they were quite clean, they spread them on the ground. "Consanguinity was no obstacle to a marriage, except the relation of parent and child. Children were disposed of by their parents, and it was disreputable, if not unlawful, to marry without their consent. The father gave a portion to his daughter; and the bridegroom, considerable presents to his spouse; and also, it would appear, to her father, as we make settlements. The same custom prevailed among the Hebrews in the time of Jacob. Polygamy, perhaps, made women scarce, but it did not prevail among the Greeks."

"As soon as a person died, his eyes and mouth were affectionately closed by his nearest relations; and the want of this ceremony was deeply lamented by the friends of those who died in war, or abroad.* * *The body was then washed and anointed. It was afterwards rolled in a cloth, and covered with a sepulchral robe. The corpse was then laid out with the feet to the porch. The mourning then began accompanied by singers, who sung the funeral dirge, while the women beat their bosoms, tore their hair, and threw it on the corpse. This sometimes lasted many days. The principal mourners expressed their grief by rolling in the dust. Achilles threw hot ashes on his head, like the mourners among the Jews. * * * The bodies were all burned in Homer's day, and the bones collected in a vase, which was buried in the earth." Funeral feasts followed. This custom prevails in Wales, where we, some time ago, attended to the grave, the body of a lady cut off in the prime of life, and after the ceremony of burial, returned to the parent's house, accompanied by the large funeral procession. A bountiful feast was prepared, at which the mother presided, and the brothers assisted. And, certainly, the festivities of the day little harmonized with the solemn occasion.

Section Sixth. The ornamental and mechanical Arts. Music was in the highest repute, of which the lyre was the favourite instrument. Statuary existed, but we know not in what state. Painting seems to have been unknown.

In his concluding remarks, our author says, that "Theology is the most defective part of their system." We think that his book is defective in this respect. There should, in our opinion, be a more particular account of the religion of the Greeks. We think our author cannot prove, that sentiments of genuine piety and virtue may be ascribed to the higher orders of the people, and that their practice was better than their theory. The conduct of the heroes on the plains of Troy, appears to us any thing but religious and moral.

The assertion, "that as to morals we have no reason to plume ourselves on superiority," is, also, we think, unfounded and incautious. They were, in our opinion, semi-barbarians. Dr. Bruce indeed admits, that "the principal objects of war were plunder by land, and piracy by sea."

Whilst the Greeks had no knowledge of the One True God, and had no code of morality, the Jews of that age worshipped Jehovah as the Lord of Universal Nature, despised the gods of the Heathens, and were in possession of a pure code of morality. Whilst they were not superior to the Greeks in refinement, in the arts and sciences, they were incomparably before all other nations in religious and moral wisdom. Whence had this gross and stiff-necked people, all their knowledge? whence did they obtain their superiority? From God, reply all Jews and Christians. This answer is satisfactory. Unbelievers can give no consistent reply. All their explanations are irrational.

A Summary View of the State of the Argument, on the Historical Evidences of Christianity, between Mr. Beard and his opponents, Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor. From "The Historical Evidences of Christianity Unassailable," &c.

After reading an extended treatise on any subject, it is well, I think, to read an abstract; as the subject is hence better understood, and longer remembered. It was under this impression, that the following "Brief View," &c. was drawn up; and in order that others may derive good from it, as well as myself, it is now sent for insertion in your valuable Miscellany.

My object also, is, by this means, to recommend Mr. Beard's admirable and able work; which, from its rare

merit, and the vital importance of the subject, deserves an extensive circulation. It is the only proper and Christian way, in which Deists can be met; and it can hardly fail, I think, to be eminently useful.

True, if Mr. B. could have been influenced by a regard to the character of his opponents, *as* opponents—their ribaldry, and recklessness of controversial principle—he would have remained silent. But he acted from the more worthy motive, a regard to others, whom their false statements and calumnies might lead astray. And are such to be lost, because those who delude them are disreputable? Truly, those Christians, who could thus argue, and thus act, would ill deserve the name. Christ came to seek and save those that were lost; and we are exhorted, in our endeavours to imitate his example, to "consider him, who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest we be wearied and faint in our minds." If baseness of character, were to cover the attacks of the infidel, then it would be his policy to be the basest of the base. And thus, a premium would be offered to wickedness, and the interests of Christianity would be sacrificed to a false shame. In fact, it ought never to be the question in these cases,—Is a writer respectable? but,—Is he capable of disseminating error? If so, the honest advocate of truth, who "seeks the praise of God, rather than the praise of men," will feel it to be an imperative duty, strenuously to oppose him. Mr. B. has acted on this principle of disinterested zeal, and "singleness of eye towards God;" having had regard to the "misinformed," and having been "desirous of benefiting the deluded." He has done his duty—he has done it well. May professing Christians do theirs, and spread his work; and not manifest that mistaken fastidious delicacy, which is frightened at the appearance of a few "wretched names."*

"But for these vile guns,
He would himself have been a soldier."

F.

LETTERS I. & II.—*Mr. Beard and Mr. Carlile.*

Mr. B.—Sir, In "The Republican," dated Friday, October 14, 1825, are some observations, calling in question the real existence of Jesus Christ. You have long been clamorous for opponents. I have thought it

* Monthly Repository, New Series, p. 287.

my duty, to expose the errors and falsehoods of which you have been guilty, in the paper above alluded to. I most deeply regret, that I am constrained to charge you with falsehood; but I *believe* that you are guilty. I must call things by their proper names; the claims of truth are paramount. [L. i. p. 1.]

Mr. C.—Sir, The history of Jesus Christ is a fable, because the two words forming his name, are synonymous. Such a name would never have been adopted by those, who understood the meaning of both words; it is a tautology, which no people ever adopted in the way of title, except a few names among ourselves. [L. i. pp. 1, 2.]

Mr. B.—I deny both your premises and conclusion, though in fact, you have refuted yourself, with your *except*, &c. It is not true, on your own showing, that "no people," &c. But the words are not synonymous. The word Jesus, is derived from a Hebrew root, and the word Christ, from a Greek root. The former, signifies to save; the latter, anoint. Besides, such a mode of argumentation, would go to prove, that there never was such a person as Alexander—that is, the *great*, the *powerful* man; Cato the Censor—that is, the *wise*, the *grave:* or Desiderius Erasmus—the first name Latin, the second Greek, and both synonymous, meaning the beloved. It would blot out of existence, all the William Williams's, the John Johns, and the Thomas Thomson's. Nay, the great globe itself, would vanish at your magic touch, and leave not a wreck behind; because it is called a sphere, and an orb; the first Greek, the second Latin; and both signifying that which is round! But, to be serious, it is really astonishing, that any man with the least pretensions to rationality, can have recourse to such an argument. [L. i. pp. 1, 2.]

Mr. C.—The words Jesus Christ, are identical.

Mr. B.—This I cannot admit; and you yourself allow, that they are not derived from the same root. Nor are they equivalent in their application; for the one cannot hold the place of the other. We can say, Jesus the Christ, but not Christ the Jesus. The word Christ, is descriptive of the Messiah, the word Jesus is not. [L. ii. p. 32.]

Mr. C.—But it is the circumstance, that Jesus Christ was a new name, and a name doubled when given, that disproves the real existence of such a person.

Mr. B.—Now the words, taken separately, were not new when given. You may read of several persons of

the name of Jesus, in the writings of Josephus; and Lardner contends, that the false prophets, who rose up before the destruction of Jerusalem, assumed the name of Christ. Nor was the name Jesus Christ, doubled when first used. We do not find it so doubled during the childhood of Jesus: then, his appellation was Jesus, not Jesus Christ. He did not receive his title of office, until he began to discharge the functions of his office. [L. ii. p. 33.]

Mr. C.—The story of Jesus is a fable, because the names of the disciples are *all* Grecian.

Mr. B.—Here you again confute yourself; for you grant that one of the names among them, *Levi*, was Jewish. Besides, the names of the following *disciples*,—Zaccheus, Barnabas, Lazarus, Cleophas, Judas (not Iscariot), Annanias, Sapphira, Tabitha, and Mary, are not of the Greek, but Hebrew origin. And the names of the following *Apostles*,—Simon, James (the same as Jacob), John, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, and James (the son of Alpheus), are derived also from the same source. In fact, the argument is nothing, as it was a custom with the Jews to exchange their Hebrew for a Grecian name, when they left their native country; as many did a long time previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. [L. i. p. 3, 4.]

Mr. C.—We have another proof: the first preachers of Christianity were all Grecians.

Mr. B.—Well, supposing that they were all Grecians, that does not prove "that the story of Jesus was of Grecian origin." The first preachers of Christianity in England were Italians; had, therefore, the Christian religion its origin in Italy? But to show you how well authorized you are in ascribing to Christianity a "Grecian origin," I subjoin a quotation or two, from your friend Celsus. He says, that "some Jews in the time of Jesus, made a sedition against the body of the people of the Jewish nation, and followed Jesus;" that Jesus was "the first author of this sedition," that he was born "in a Jewish village," and was the "man of Nazareth." I leave Mr. Carlile to battle the matter with his Deistical associate Celsus. [L. i. p. 4, 5.]

Mr. C.—The affixing of the designation, Baptist, to the name of John the Baptist, proves that the Christian religion is of Grecian origin.

Mr. B.—The consequence of this argument will be apparent to all, when it is known, that, as the Greeks had spread themselves and their language through the East,

long before the Christian era, so was it customary to give Greek names to persons who were Hebrews. Thus Salome, the widow of Aristobulus, was also called Alexandra; the first a Hebrew, the second a Greek appellation. Josephus, in giving an account of his family, says, "My grandfather's father was named Simon (Hebrew) with *the addition* of Psellus (Greek). This *Simon Psellus* had nine sons. Matthias had a son called *Matthias Curtus* (the first Hebrew, the second Latin). I have three sons, Hyrcanus, Justus, and Agrippa," and not one of them a Hebrew name. Nay, the very name, John the Baptist, which you have endeavoured to press into your service, is decidedly against your supposition. John was a Jew; his surname Baptist, therefore, does not establish the Grecian, but, according to your reasonings, the Hebrew origin of the Christian religion; whilst this name also confirms my proof, that it was usual to give Greek names and surnames to persons who were Jews by faith. And, besides, no Heathen would have borne a Hebrew name, John. [L. ii. pp. 33, 34.]

Mr. C.—But I question if the Hebrew names that you adduce are really Hebrew, because they are not found in the Old Testament.

Mr. B.—This is the first time that ever I heard that the only way to prove a word to be of Hebrew origin, was by finding it in the Old Testament. Following this your method of determining what is Hebrew, I might prove Chaldee and Coptic, to be Hebrew words. It is not, however, the discovery of a word in a particular book, that decides its origin, but the letters of which it is composed. And by this rule, it is that Schleusner decides, that the words before adduced, are of Hebrew origin. But you will find, that more than "either of the names," is read in the books of the Old Testament, by referring to Gen. xxix. 33, xxxiv. 25, &c. where Simon, or Simeon occurs; to Gen. xxv. 26, 27. &c. where James, in Greek Jakob, Jacob, occurs; to 1 Chron. iii. 24, 2 Kings xxv. 23. (Alexandrine version and Schleusner,) where John occurs. On your own showing, the first and immediate disciples were not Greeks. And as you "hold the good foundation of Christianity to require the circumstance, that they were Jews," this condition is fulfilled—they were Jews; and again, on your own showing, Christianity rested on "a good foundation." [L. ii. pp. 34, 35.]

Mr. C.—Save the Toldoth Jeschu, an answered Jewish production of the second century, there has not been handed down to us a single Christian document in the language of Jesus, and his pretended Jewish disciples.

Mr. B.—The Toldoth Jeschu, is not a Jewish production of the second century, but a modern work, written in the fourteenth or fifteenth century. And supposing there has not been handed down to us a single document in the language of Jesus and his disciples, this will not disprove the existence of Christ. Refer me to the documents handed down to us, written by Lycurgus, Zoroaster, and Pythagoras, or their contemporaries, in the language in which they severally spoke. Our Saxon and Norman kings, whose lives and deeds have been recorded in Latin, would all be annihilated by you. But now again as to facts. The language in which Jesus and his disciples spoke, was not Hebrew. A dialect of this, called the Aramean, and the Greek and Roman languages, were those chiefly used in Judea, after the Babylonish captivity. Now, it so happens, that we have the whole of the New Testament transmitted to us, in a dialect most closely similar to that in which Jesus spoke. I allude to the New Testament in Syriac. But the very Greek of the New Testament, is the strongest confutation of your position. It is the production of foreigners, and those foreigners Jews. It is the clothing of Hebrew ideas and phraseology in Greek letters; and proves that these books originated in Judea, before the destruction of Jerusalem. At no later period could it have been written. [L. i. pp. 5—7.]

Mr. C.—As to the existence of Lycurgus, Zoroaster, and our Saxon and Norman kings, it is a matter of indifference.

Mr. B.—In other words, the history of the past, is no guide for the future, and consequently worthless. And yet you require these great ones of antiquity, to trace back to them the moral precepts of the Gospel, in order to maintain your hypothesis of the origin of Christianity! [L. ii. p. 37.]

Mr. C.—But I have reason for believing in Lycurgus, &c. in preference to Jesus Christ. They are not wonder-workers, and pretenders to preternatural powers.

Mr. B.—You are certainly an unfortunate man in the way of assertion: the comedy of errors you enact over and over again; for read these extracts from Enfield's Brucker:

"*Several miracles* are ascribed to Zoroaster, such as an artful impostor would naturally attempt. *He suffered melted metal* to be poured upon his bosom, and held fire in his hand, without suffering injury." "Lycurgus committed no leaves to writing, but issued them forth *as the edicts of Apollo*, from the oracle at Delphi." And "Pythagoras repaired to Delos, and after presenting an offering of cakes to Apollo, then *received, or pretended to receive*, moral dogmas from the priestess, which he afterwards delivered to his disciples, under the *character of divine precepts*." [L. ii. pp. 37, 38.]

(To be continued.)

Sunday Morning.

Eternal Spirit! Majesty Supreme!
Essence of all on Earth, and Heaven above!
Thou Soul of Life! whose agencies aye beam
On all around, in rays of gladsome love;
Who brood'st, as erst, upon this glorious frame,
And lo! it teems with agencies of good—
Proclaims aloud the glories of thy name—
Inspires in human-kind a more than earthly mood;
This is thy morn, thy day: O day of joy!
Dumb be my tongue, departed every thought,
Ere I forget, that bliss without alloy,
On this thy day, thy Son, our Saviour brought.
Jesus! thou friend of man! all hail to thee!
In glowing warmth my soul now brings her meed
Of joyous thanks, and bows the willing knee
To Him who wroughtst through thee a glorious deed.
Now all around, great God, from thy high throne
Behold thy children hasten to thy courts;
There, tottering age with weight of years borne down,
And joyful youth, awhile resign their sports,
And graver manhood with composed pace;
Each hears thy voice, and speeds, at thy behest,
To eat the bread of life, and win the heavenly race,
And at the marriage feast, be found a welcome guest.
Oh may their prayers, all varied though they be,
Like rays of that bless'd orb, thy imaged love,
Commingled rise in purity to Thee,
And holy offering, grateful incense prove!

Now swell the notes of thy glad children, Lord;
And lo! their hearts, high-borne on wings of praise,
The holy dome, loud echoes back the word,
And all around are sacred, heavenly lays.
Instinct with feeling, from the pious song,
Lo! murmur soft, both penitence and prayer,
And waft the soul above; and oh! they long
In converse bless'd, eternity to share.
And then, if power were given, I might unfold
How soft distil the agencies of Heaven,
And bliss bestow, to sinful men untold,
And glimpses bright, which speak all sin forgiven.
Father Supreme! 'tis thine, who knowest the heart,
Thus to our wants, to adapt thy heavenly aid;
And oh! to me, thy servant, Lord! impart—
Who fain would love this day which thou hast made—
Impart thy grace, that, with undying strains,
My soul may praise thy all-redeeming love;
Commence below, what, oh! on heavenly plains
In bright array, in angel form above,
Where kindred souls enjoy communion sweet,
And all around exults in life and bliss,
Eternity itself shall not complete,
But age to age, my gladsome song be this:
Blessing, and honour, glory, and power,
To Him who sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb for ever.

G. C. S.

Causes of the Progress of Liberal Christianity in New England.—Printed for the American Unitarian Association.

WHERE a people for a long succession of years have been making a steady, continual, and unexampled progress in religious inquiry, it is but reasonable to refer it to causes deeply seated in those institutions which distinguish them from other nations, and in their fixed and peculiar habits of thinking and acting. The history of religious opinions in this section of our country, presents, as I conceive, a striking illustration of the justness of this remark. Never has there been a change greater or more remarkable; but the careful and attentive observer will be able to trace it, without much difficulty, to the operation of the same

general causes, to which we are likewise indebted for almost every thing else, that distinguishes the condition, or the character, of the people of New England. I have thought it would be useful to consider some of these causes; and to point out the bearing and influence they have had on the progress of Liberal Christianity.

I do not mean by this, that the progress of Liberal Christianity has been confined to a particular spot. Owing to the liberal tendencies of our government, and all our public institutions, and to the general diffusion of knowledge and a spirit of inquiry through the community, it has undoubtedly been making progress in every part of our country; and owing, also, to the liberal tendencies of the age, and the advancement of society and the human mind, it has, at the same time, been making progress in every part of the world. My only object, therefore, is, to mention some of the causes, which have made this progress more rapid, and more observable here, than elsewhere; and to show, that these causes are the same which have contributed to the advancement of New England in all other respects.

The first of these causes may be found in the character of our Puritan ancestors, and in the impulse which their example gave to religious inquiry, and religious liberty.

They were consistent *Protestants*, called Puritans, says a cotemporary, because they "would have the church thoroughly reformed; that is, purged from all those inventions, which have been brought into it since the age of the apostles, and reduced entirely to the Scripture purity." "Nothing was more disagreeable to them," says the author of the New England Chronology, "than to be called by the name of any mere man whatever, since they renounced all attachment to any mere human systems or expositions of Scripture, and reserved an entire and perpetual liberty of searching the inspired records, and of forming both their principles and practice from those discoveries they should make therein, without imposing them on others." It is not pretended that the rights of private judgment were understood then, as they are understood now. Even Hume, however, though he despised their superstition, and detested most of their political leanings, is yet constrained to pass on the Independents, the high eulogium, that "of all Christian sects, this was the first, which, during its prosperity as well as its adversity, always adopted the principle of toleration."

Besides, our fathers were not only Protestants, but Protestant *dissenters;* "rooters," as they were sometimes scornfully termed by their enemies, an appellation still more pointed and significant, than the modern term, "radical." It matters not what were the particular doctrines, or what the particular practices, on account of which they separated from the Established Church; it is the effect of their example as separatists, that we are considering. It was not the wearing of the surplice, or the kneeling at the altar, that they objected to, so much as the authority that would impose them, and the danger of the precedent, should they once submit to the imposition. It was the bold and vigorous stand they made against arbitrary power; their determination to live and die by the principle, that the Scriptures are the only authority to be acknowledged in religious matters, reserving to themselves the right of judging what Scripture is, and what Scripture means; it was their determined and prompt resistance to all usurpations over the mind and conscience, in whatever shape they might come, and however trivial in their first demands, which stamped the character of the men, and, I may add, the character of the race. It was not their peculiar opinions, nor their peculiar practices, which they transmitted to their descendents; but, what they valued more than either, their peculiar spirit; and this I trust will live in us, and be cherished by us, as long as a drop of their blood flows in our veins.

But it was not merely a courage to assert and defend the right of private judgment, that distinguished our puritan ancestors, but a much rarer quality—a courage to exercise this right. Though setting a high and just value on Luther's Reformation, they did not think, that Luther's Reformation had made them so wise, that the Word of God might not make them wiser. They had early fallen under the censure of Elizabeth, as being "overbold with the Almighty, making too many scannings of his blessed will, as lawyers did with human testaments." When they came to a determination to establish themselves here, we have abundant documents to prove, that it was with a strong presentiment, a confident expectation, that God had, as they themselves beautifully expressed it, "more truth yet to break forth out of his Holy Word." They evidently looked forward to the time, when the poor churches, which they were planting in the wilderness, would take the lead

in a much more thorough reformation, than had yet been attempted. Whether this expectation was well or ill founded, it had this important practical effect on those who indulged it. It led them to study the Scriptures with less prejudice, and a more careful scrutiny; believing that they might find there, what they had never found there before. The impulse, which this gave to religious inquiry, has been perpetuated; and we have but yielded to it in coming to the opinions, which we now hold.

I say again, therefore, that one cause which has made the progress of Liberal Christianity more rapid, and more observable here, than elsewhere, is to be found in the character of our puritan ancestors, and in the impulse which their example gave to religious inquiry, and religious liberty. It is time for men to be done with the senseless clamour, that we have departed from the principles of the Fathers of New England. If it is merely meant by this, that we have been able to make some progress in religious knowledge during the two long centuries that have intervened, is this any cause of wonder? Is this a proper ground of accusation? Nay, is this any thing more than what, as we have seen, our fathers themselves expected? Besides, it is nothing to the purpose to prove, that our opinions and practices are different from theirs; for the circumstances are also different. It must be shown, that our opinions and practices would have been different from theirs, had they been placed in the same circumstances. The question is, whether we are in the same progress, not whether we are in the same *stage* of the progress; for, supposing us to be in progress, this *must* alter from age to age. The question is, whether we are men of the same cast of character; and being so, whether it is possible for us to hold different opinions from what we do, in the present advanced state of society and the human mind. For who were our fathers?—Were they the men who thought that the Reformation had gone far enough? No.—Were they the men who conceived that nothing more was to be learned from the Bible? No.—Were they the men to tamely acquiesce in the imposition of a creed, which the age had outgrown? No.—Were they the men to shrink from an avowal of their dissent from popular and long established errors, from a dread of the cry of innovation? No. All history answers, No. Neither are we; and it is because we are not, that we hold our present position

in the religious world; and should we ever desert it from timidity, or betray it from inconstancy, we prove ourselves, by that act, unworthy of our name and race. I believe, as I believe I live, that if the Fathers of New England—if Robinson and Higginson, Bradford and Winthrop—had been born two hundred years later, they would have been found among our warmest and most effective coadjutors. And in that cloud of Witnesses, who have finished their testimony, and are now looking down on the struggles and triumphs of truth in this world, I believe, as I believe I live, that there are none, who will behold with more joy than they, that the impulse, which their example gave to religious inquiry, and religious liberty, has not been lost on the generations that have followed them.

The second cause, which I shall mention as making the progress of Liberal Christianity more rapid and more observable in New England, than elsewhere, is to be found in the popular cast of our religious institutions.

It is remarkable, that the principle of Independency has been adopted in the prevailing form of church government no where else, but in New England. Here, however, our ancestors took special care, that the privilege should be secured; and watched with a searching jealousy every motion in church or state, that threatened its infringement. To the demands of popes, or bishops, or councils, or synods, or consistories, or presbyteries, they had but one answer to make, and that was always ready:—"Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" They conceived, that every congregation of Christians possessed within itself all ecclesiastical powers and faculties; to be exercised and applied according to the will of the whole, or, in case they were divided, of a majority of its members. To preserve a community of interest, protection, and fellowship, they did, indeed, make it the duty of every such church to consult the neighbouring churches in all important events, such as the ordination of a minister; and in all cases of difficulty, or internal dissension; and to follow the advice given them, provided they thought it good advice: but it was expressly forbidden them to submit to it as authority. I find it stated thus in one of their old books: "If a church in a citie and the officers thereof, be of more eminent gifts and graces, than a church in a village, it is a just occasion for the church in the village to listen the more after the *counsel* of the church in the

citie; but not to submit the more unto their *authority*. And so it is true, a classis of the presbyters of *many* churches may excel (in more variety of all abilities) than the presbyterie of any *one* church; yet that only reacheth to make their counsel the more weighty and acceptable, but not to invest them with more rule, or more authority." Nay, so jealous were they, in the early settlement of the country, of any association menacing the boasted independency of their churches, that when it was understood, that the ministers of Boston and the vicinity were in the habit of meeting once a-fortnight at each other's houses, where some question was commonly debated, the practice was much frowned on by the ministers of Salem; on the ground, as they said, that "it would grow into a presbytery, or superintendency, to the prejudice of the church liberties."

(To be Continued.)

On the Language of Scripture.

(Continued from page 7.)

John i. 1–14. We are not aware that any passage occurs in Matthew, Mark, and Luke (Mat. xxviii. 19, we considered in our last), which presents any serious objection to the Unitarian scheme—a circumstance most extraordinary and unaccountable, if Trinitarianism is vital Christianity. Certainly, the Apostles, during the life of Jesus upon earth, never entertained the notion that he was the Almighty God. The orthodox Fathers unhesitatingly admit this fact; and it must be allowed by all those Trinitarians who have a due regard to the consistency and rationality of the Gospel narratives. The demeanour of the Apostles towards their Master, can by no means be reconciled with the opinion, that they believed him to be the Eternal God, the Maker of heaven and earth. Had they entertained this notion, would not their minds have been always impressed with sentiments of the profoundest reverence? would they ever have questioned the propriety of his conduct? would they have associated with him on terms of familiarity? How can the following passage be reconciled with the notion, that they considered Jesus Christ to be their Lord and their God? Mark iv. 38, "He was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow: and they awake him, and say unto him, Master,

carest thou not that we perish?" And after he had quieted the storm, they "said one to another, What *manner of man* is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?" Would Judas have betrayed, would Peter have denied, would all the Apostles have forsook, him whom they believed to be their Creator and Preserver! Their conduct is satisfactorily explained on the principles of Unitarianism; but, according to the orthodox scheme, their conduct presents insurmountable difficulties. But we cannot, within the limits we assign to the critical remarks on the language of Scripture, enlarge on this subject. We recommend our Trinitarian readers to pursue this train of thought, and, in imagination, to place themselves in the situation of the Apostles, and to consider how they would have acted toward Christ. We must proceed to the Gospel of John. This history is regarded as the grand support of the doctrine of the supreme deity of Jesus. It was written to supply the deficiencies of the other Evangelical narratives, and, according to many, to bring fully to light the deity of Christ. The most plausible passage in favour of this doctrine, occurs in the proem to John's Gospel, i. 1–14. The passage is certainly liable to much misrepresentation. We do not think that it presents any serious objections to the doctrine of the Divine Unity, and the inferiority of Christ, so frequently inculcated in this very Gospel. Some expositors, as Lardner, Priestley, Wakefield, interpret the logos, the word, to mean wisdom—that divine wisdom by which the universe was planned, and is preserved. According to this interpretation, the passage gives no countenance to the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. But we agree with those interpreters, who explain the logos to mean Jesus Christ; and we are confirmed in this opinion, by the frequent appropriation of figurative names in John's Gospel, to designate different relations which our blessed Master sustained. He is denominated the way, the truth, the life, a door, a vine, a shepherd, &c. He was the way, as he pointed out the path to heaven; the truth, as he revealed the most important truths; the life, as he taught the doctrine of eternal life; the door, as his principles are the means through which we must enter into the kingdom of heaven; and the word, because he revealed the word, or will of God. 1, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. Beginning* is a relative term, which must be limited by the

connexion. Thus, Christ says to his Apostles, "Ye have been with me from the beginning." *To be with God*, means to have intimate intercourse with him, or to participate in his counsels for the welfare of mankind. Thus, Moses was with God; and, 1 Cor. vii. 24, "Let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God."

The Word was God, or as it may be translated (there being no article before θεος, *theos*), the word was a god, *i. e.* was a god to us, was in the place of God to men, was his ambassador, and spake as God gave him commandment, so that his words were not his own, but the Father's who sent him. Moses was a god to Pharaoh, Ex. vii. 1, and θεος, *theos*, is put metaphorically for any prophet, and is not unfrequently used to signify magistrates and princes. John x. 34, 35, "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods to whom the word of God came," &c. See, also, Ex. xxii. 28, Psalm xcvii. 9, 1 Cor. viii. 5, as there be gods many and lords many.

3d verse, *All things were made by him.* "All" is frequently used in a restrictive sense, the limitation of which must be fixed by the context. Mat. iii. 5, "Then went out to him *all* Judea;" John ii. 10, &c. The word εγενετο, *egeneto*, here translated "were made," is never used by John in the sense of creation. "The verb γινομαι," says Mr. Simpson, "occurs about 680 times in the New Testament. But I cannot find that it is ever used by the Apostle John, in any of his writings, for proper original creation. Nor can I find that it occurs in this sense throughout the whole New Testament, excepting in the three following instances—James iii. 9, Heb. xi. 3, Heb. iv. 3." This remark is borne out by the testimony of Schleusner. He says the word has various significations in the New Testament; and, under the sixteenth sense, inserts that of creation, which is sanctioned only by the passages just mentioned. He indeed, as a Trinitarian, adduces the passage under consideration. To give the unusual meaning of creation to this word, is not translating according to the general rule, of adhering, if possible, to the sense in which the word is usually employed. To render εγενετο, *egeneto*, "was made," as is done in the 3d, 10th, and 14th verses of this proem of our common version, is wresting the language of the Apostle to preconceived notions, and perverting the sense of the passage.

The word primarily signifies "to be," "to become." The passage properly translated, intimates, that all things relative to the Christian dispensation, were effected through Christ. 10, *The world was by him,* i. e. was enlightened by him. 14, *And the word was flesh,* i. e. was literally a human being, a man approved of God. The passages which we have considered, may be thus explained. At the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, appeared the great Preacher of righteousness, who was filled with the spirit of wisdom, made acquainted with the divine counsels for the redemption of the world, and was sent to us as the vicegerent of the Almighty. 3, Through the instrumentality of the divinely inspired Jesus, the plan of redemption was carried on, and perfected. 10, The world was enlightened by him; but (11) his countrymen to whom he preached, would not acknowledge his claims. 12, 13, Those, however, who became his disciples, partook of the privileges of the new dispensation, and became heirs of the kingdom of heaven, and sons of God, being by the operation of the principles of his religion, born again to newness of life. 14, The messenger of this dispensation was a man, and spent some time among us. He was full of grace and truth.

(To be continued.)

To the Rev. Robert Stewart, Minister of the Gospel, at Broughshane, Ireland.—Letter 3.

Sir,

I begin to fear that I am rather unprofitably employed, in commenting on your Discourse, which is little known beyond a very limited circle, and even there, is fast hastening to forgetfulness. I know that I am thus giving a degree of publicity to it, which it could not otherwise have obtained; and that, by embalming it in the pages of this work, I am preserving its remains a little longer, from irremediable and hopeless decay. But I write, chiefly for the sake of those who have been taught from their earliest years, to consider the doctrine of a *three-one* God, as essential to Christianity, and whose deeply-rooted prejudices, your work has a tendency to strengthen and confirm. And should these lines ever meet the eyes of such persons, I would beseech them to consider, that they are written by one, who is a sincere believer in the doctrines of the Gospel, and who has the same interest with them, in its sublime and awful truths.

Under a deep sense, then, of religious duty, I shall proceed to discuss the validity of those reasons which you have assigned, in support of opinions which you once *secretly* questioned, and yet *publicly* taught, and which you now wish us to understand, are the honest convictions of

a *newly-awakened* mind. From respect to that sacred profession to which you belong—from a warm attachment to our common faith as Christians—and from regard to your own immortal soul, I will try to suppress every rising doubt, and to persuade myself, that although mistaken, you are still sincere. It is not the part of weak and erring mortals, to judge with harshness of their brethren; or to assign unworthy motives for that conduct, which they cannot satisfactorily explain. "Charity *believeth* all things—*hopeth* all things—*endureth* all things."

Your first objection to Unitarianism, is, that "it originated with the learned, and to them is almost exclusively confined."

There are few points more strongly insisted on by Unitarian Christians, than the insufficiency of human authority, in matters of religious opinion. They profess to receive their faith from *the Sacred Scriptures alone;* and they feel it their duty, with all humility and reverence, to endeavour to find out what is really taught therein. Instead of grounding their belief on *creeds* and *confessions,* drawn up by weak and fallible men, and which unavoidably partake of human infirmity, they derive their religion from the BIBLE, that blessed fountain of truth.

It has been alleged by the famous Archbishop of Dublin, in one of those violent tirades which he is in the habit of uttering against those who have the presumption to differ from him, that the Unitarians are destitute of learning and science. How hard it is, in these troublous times, to escape censure! We are excluded, by intolerant statutes, from the splendidly endowed Universities of England; and are therefore pronounced, by Archepiscopal authority, to be ignorant, and incapable of comprehending the mysteries of the Christian religion! When we avail ourselves of the means of knowledge still within our reach, and apply the little portion of learning which we have obtained, to inquire what the sacred truths are which the Gospel reveals, the Minister of Broughshane, rivaling the presumption of the High Church Intolerant, immediately pronounces, that our opinions "originated with the learned, and are to this day, to them almost exclusively confined; and that he thinks, without a solitary exception, the persons who adhere to them, are proud of their understandings!" Between such *distinguished*—yet conflicting—authorities, I presume not to decide. If to be incapable of comprehending, how "the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty, and yet that there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty," be a proof of our utter and deplorable ignorance, we must plead guilty to the charge. If to exercise that understanding which God has given us, upon subjects of all others most interesting to us, be a proof of the pride of intellect, we must again plead guilty to the charge. But if the worship which the Most High requires from us, be "a reasonable service"—if the religion of the blessed Jesus, happily accord with the dictates of our understandings and the best feelings of our hearts—if, to think and judge for ourselves in that awful concern, which lies exclusively between us and our God, be the dear, and inalienable inheritance of our rational and immortal natures, then do we repel the charges; and whilst we employ the means which a kind and gracious Providence has afforded us, for seeking the knowledge of our duty, we will steadfastly persevere, in the humble hope, that the Father of our spirits, will mercifully guide us in the paths of holiness and truth.

But although the Unitarian bows not to the authority of names, in matters of faith, and is fully persuaded that the great truths which he believes, are so plainly taught in the book of God, "that he who runs may read," still he reflects with honest pride, on many not less distinguished for their splendid acquirements than venerable for their worth, who have professed the same opinions. Amongst these, stand eminently conspicuous, the names of Milton, Newton, Locke, Chillingworth, and Lardner. Are these the men whom you so happily characterise, "as

proud of their understandings?"—men, whose talents have shed unfading lustre on the land that gave them birth—who will live in the page of history, whilst knowledge and science, and moral worth, and civil and religious freedom are valued upon earth.

The Unitarian, too, in these days of *apostasy* and *backsliding*, dwells with unmingled satisfaction, on the conduct of those holy men, who, in obedience to the voice of conscience, sacrificed worldly advantages, and patiently endured reproach and suffering. The memory of such confessors as Emlyn, Robertson, Wakefield, and Theophilus Lindsey, will long be dear to those, who are capable of appreciating integrity of principle. And he who can read Belsham's Life of Lindsey, though he may not be able to subscribe to all the opinions, either of the Confessor or his Biographer, must have a mind strangely constituted, if he feel not an overpowering interest in the struggles and sacrifices of this truly eminent servant of God.

Nor must I omit the respected name of Dr. Whitby, who, after deep and serious thought, felt it his duty to renounce the Trinitarian doctrine, which he had long defended; and in his "Last Thoughts," plainly and honestly avowed the change. This portion of his writings has indeed been disingenuously suppressed by the publishers of his "Commentary;" but it has been preserved, and I trust will be handed down to the latest times, as the testimony of a good man, who felt that he was shortly to appear in the presence of God. It is in these words: "When I wrote my Commentaries on the New Testament, I went on, *too hastily*, I own, in the common beaten road of other reputed orthodox divines; conceiving first, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in one complex notion, were one and the same God, by virtue of the same individual essence, communicated from the Father. This confused notion, I am now fully convinced to be a thing *impossible*, and full of gross *absurdities* and contradictions. And this my retractation or change of my opinion, after all my endeavours to assert and establish a contrary doctrine, deserves the more to be considered, because it proceeds, and indeed *can* proceed from no other reason, but purely from the strong and irresistible convictions which are now upon me, that I *was mistaken*. Nothing, I say, but the love of truth can be supposed to extort such a *retractation* from me, who having lived so long beyond the common period of life, can have nothing else to do but to prepare for my great change; and in order thereunto, to make my peace with God, and my own conscience, before I die. To this purpose, I solemnly appeal to the Searcher of hearts, and call God to witness, whether I have *hastily* or *rashly* departed from the common opinion; or rather, whether I have not *deliberately* and *calmly* weighed the arguments on both sides, drawn from Scripture and antiquity."

"So that, upon the whole, if I have erred in changing my opinion, I desire it may be observed, that my error hath neither *prejudice* nor *secular views* to support it; and that my mistake, if such it will be reputed, hath been all along attended with constant prayers to the Throne of Grace, and what hath always appeared to me the strongest reason and undeniable evidence."

In one of the notes appended to your Discourse, you have adduced the authority of Dr. Watts, in favour of the Trinitarian doctrine. I pretend not to be able to assign to that excellent man, the particular name by which his opinions can be fairly designated; but I think it is abundantly plain, that had he lived in these times, he would not have subscribed the test of orthodoxy that has been devised by the *Presbyterian Inquisition*. It has been affirmed, on the respected testimony of Dr. Lardner, that *Dr. Watts' last thoughts were completely Unitarian*. And in his Solemn Address to the Deity, this humble, devout Christian, expresses himself in language to which my heart responds Amen. "Hadst thou informed me, gracious Father," said this holy man, "in any place of thy

Word, that this divine doctrine is not to be understood by men, and yet they were required to believe it, I would have subdued all my curiosity to faith. But I cannot find thou hast any where forbid me to understand it, or make these inquiries. I have, therefore, been long searching into this divine doctrine, that I may pay thee due honour with understanding. Surely I ought to know the God whom I worship, whether he be one pure and simple Being, or whether thou art a threefold Deity, consisting of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

"Thou hast called the poor and the ignorant, the mean and foolish things of this world, to the knowledge of thyself, and thy Son. But how can such weak creatures ever take in so strange, so difficult, and so abstruse a doctrine as this, in the explication and defence whereof, multitudes of men, even men of learning and piety, have lost themselves in infinite subtilties of disputes and endless mazes of darkness? And can this *strange* and *perplexing notion* of three real persons, going to make up one true God, be so necessary and important a part of that Christian doctrine, which, in the Old Testament, and the New, is represented as so plain and easy, even to the meanest understanding?"

In illustration of your argument, you affirm, that "no unsophisticated descendant of Adam, who comes to the Bible, as to an oracle or fountain of wisdom; who comes to be instructed, and not to question his own need of instruction, will ever read from that book, that the personage mentioned in our text, was either mere man or created angel!"

Now all this is gratuitous assumption on your part, for which you have not offered the slightest proof; and might be very fairly replied to, by assertions equally strong, on the opposite side. But I shall submit to you a different answer; and directly meet your statement, by the very remarkable case of the celebrated Rammohun Roy of Calcutta. His name and history cannot but be known to you. This illustrious Brahmin, no less distinguished for his extensive acquirements than the benevolence of his disposition, after a long and diligent inquiry into the Sacred Scriptures, has at length been led to the important conclusion, that the religion of Jesus is from God; and has since devoted himself, with unabated ardour, to the diffusion of its hallowed precepts. The Christians, with whom he first conversed, represented the doctrine of the Trinity as a fundamental doctrine of Christianity; and this impression long proved an insurmountable obstacle to his conversion. Yet, determined in a matter of such vast importance, to judge for himself, he applied with diligence to the study of the books of the Old and New Testament; and has since publicly avowed himself to be a Unitarian Christian, believing in the pre-existence and super-angelic nature of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. In one of his powerful appeals, in vindication of himself and his opinions, which had been attacked with violence, he expresses himself thus:

"Perhaps my opinions may subject me to the severe censure of those who dissent from me, and some will be ready to discover particular motives for my presuming to differ from the great majority of Christian teachers of the present day, in my view of Christianity, with the doctrines of which, I have become but recently acquainted. Personal interest can hardly be alleged, as likely to have actuated me, and therefore, the love of distinction, or notoriety, may perhaps be resorted to, to account for conduct, which they wish it to be believed, honest conviction could never direct. In reply to such an accusation, I can only protest in the most solemn manner, that even in the belief that I have been successful in combating the doctrine of Trinitarians, I cannot assume to myself the smallest merit; for what credit can be gained in proving, that one is not three, and that the same being cannot be at once man and God; or in opposing those who maintain, that all who do not admit doctrines so incomprehensible, must be therefore subjected by the All-merciful, to

eternal punishment? It is too true to be denied, that we are led by the force of the senses, to believe many things that we cannot fully understand. But where the evidence of sense does not compel us, how can we believe, what is not only *beyond* our comprehension, but *contrary* to it, and to the common course of nature, and *directly against revelation;* which declares positively the unity of God, as well as his incomprehensibility; but no where ascribes to him any number of persons, or any portion of magnitude?

"Neither are my attempts owing to a strong hope of removing early impressions from the breasts of those whose early education instilled certain ideas into their minds from the moment they became capable of receiving them; for, notwithstanding great and long continued exertions on my part, to do away Hindoo polytheism, though palpably gross and absurd, my success has been very partial. This experience, therefore, it may be suggested, ought to have been sufficient to discourage me from any other attempt of the kind; but it is my reverence for Christianity, and for the Author of this religion, that has induced me to endeavour to vindicate it from the charge of Polytheism, as far as my limited capacity and knowledge extend. It is indeed mortifying to my feelings, to find a religion, that, from its sublime doctrines and pure morality, should be respected above all other systems, reduced almost to a level with Hindoo theology, merely by *human creeds and prejudices.*

"Having derived my own opinions on this subject, *entirely from the Scriptures themselves,* I may perhaps be excused for the confidence with which I maintain them, against those of so great a majority, who appeal to the same authority for theirs; inasmuch as I attribute the different views, not to any inferiority of judgment compared with my own limited ability, but to the powerful effects of early religious impressions; for, when these are deep, reason is seldom allowed its natural scope in examining them to the bottom. Were it a practice among Christians to study first the books of the Old Testament, as found arranged in order, and to acquire a knowledge of the true force of scriptural phrases and expressions, without attending to interpretations given by any sect; and then to study the New Testament, comparing the one with the other, Christianity would not any longer be liable to be encroached upon by human opinions." And, in another part of his writings, he says, "Facts coincide entirely with my own firm persuasion of the impossibility that a doctrine so inconsistent with the evidence of the senses, as that of three persons in one being, should ever gain the sincere assent of any one, into whose mind it has not been instilled in early education. Early impressions alone can induce a Christian to believe, that *three* are *one,* and *one* is *three;* just as, by the same means, a Hindoo is made to believe that *millions* are *one,* and *one* is *millions,* and to imagine that an inanimate idol is a living substance, and capable of assuming various forms. As I have sought to attain the truths of Christianity from the words of the Author of this religion, and from the undisputed instructions of his holy Apostles, and not from a parent or tutor, I cannot help refusing my assent to any doctrine which I do not find scriptural."

Such is the testimony of this distinguished man, who has brought to the investigation of truth, talents and acquirements of a superior order; and who, by a diligent study of the *Sacred Scriptures alone,* in opposition to worldly interests, to early prepossessions, and the ties of affection, which sometimes bind a man to error, has thrown off every entanglement, and avowed himself a *Unitarian Christian.*

I hope that I have now satisfactorily removed your first objections to Unitarianism, that "it originated with the learned, and was to them almost exclusively confined." It is surely not necessary, in the present day, to prove, that in order to become a Christian, a man must not take

leave of his understanding: and the Popish doctrine, I trust, is for ever exploded, that "ignorance is the mother of devotion."

It is not either by names or numbers, that the question at issue between us can be decided. It will be found, on inquiry, that the great bulk of mankind are incapacitated, from various causes, from exercising an unbiassed judgment on these subjects, and adopt their opinions as a sort of inheritance. It is thus, that a majority are Turks at Constantinople, Catholics at Rome, Episcopalians in England, and Presbyterians in Scotland. And he who would draw conclusions in favour of the tenets of any of those denominations, from the numbers or rank of those who professed such opinions, betrays the weakness of the cause which he attempts to defend. It is an argument that may be adduced with as much force in support of error as of truth.

I am aware, that the pure and simple truths of the Gospel, as professed by Unitarians, are not likely to be agreeable either to those who are looking forward to the pomps and vanities of this life, or who are captivated by the applauses of an ignorant multitude: the religion of the Son of God "is not of this world." And had I ever dreamed differently, the recent conduct of Presbyterian Ministers, at the meeting at Strabane, must have dispelled the vision. Without any breach of Christian charity, I affirm, for *I know it to be true*, that there, numbers *professed* what they *believed not!* Some of these have renounced their opinions, from base and unworthy motives—they have forsaken us, "having loved this world." But there are others, for whom my heart still bleeds, who, from a natural timidity, have yielded to groundless fears, and, in an evil hour, have been tempted to inflict a wound on their consciences, which cannot be easily healed. I know such, and pity them; and mourn over the weakness of nature.

But very different is my feeling toward those men, who once entertained doubts on these questions, which have since, they say and boast, been satisfactorily removed; and, forgetful of their own difficulties, have urged and goaded others to do that for which their own minds must long reproach them—who have successfully practised on the fears of their former associates—who have driven them to the verge of the precipice, and then, with fiend-like disposition, have triumphed in their fall. "It was not an enemy that reproached me—then I could have borne it; neither was it he that hated me, that did magnify himself against me—then I would have hid myself from him. But it was thou, a man, mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the House of God in company."

Yours, faithfully,

September 18, 1827. VINDEX.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We earnestly request our Correspondents will favour us with their Communications, previously to the 16th of each Month; and with articles of Intelligence, previously to the 20th.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 15. NOVEMBER, 1827. Vol. II.

Causes of the Progress of Liberal Christianity in New England.—Printed for the American Unitarian Association.

(Concluded from page 64.)

IT was this ever wakeful suspicion, this unconquerable dread of every thing like ecclesiastical consociations and tribunals, to which our churches are indebted not only for much of the liberty they enjoy, but also for much of the progress they have made in religious inquiry. As it was, we know that the almost unbounded influence of Cotton, and others of the clergy of that day, gave occasion for serious alarm to the leading men of the colony; and nothing but this determination of the people to preserve their congregational independency, could have presented an effectual barrier to the encroachments of that most subtle, plausible, and imposing of all usurpations, I mean, the usurpation of the priesthood. Could they have succeeded in establishing a spiritual court—a court claiming and exercising authority over ministers and churches, over faith and conscience, like all other courts of the kind, its first act would probably have been to decree a cessation of intellectual and religious improvement throughout its jurisdiction; and it might have made the difference of a century in the advancement of the mind on the prohibited subjects. True it might, and it probably would have disclaimed the use of the civil arm. It might have had nothing to do with racks, and faggots, and dungeons, the common accompaniment of persecution in the old world. But there may be a tyranny, where there is no visible tyranny. Men may be enslaved by the use that is made of their fears, prejudices, and superstitions. The conscience may be shackled, while the body is free. Men may wear their fetters in their souls. And that it has not been so with the people of New England, has been owing not a little to the popular and independent cast of our religious institutions.

We do not pretend, that our fathers were free from the

errors and the bigotry common to their times; but there is one thing in which they differed from all their cotemporaries, and which entitles them to the gratitude and veneration of their posterity. Though they had their errors and their bigotry, they did not seek to entail them on their descendants, by incorporating them into formularies and creeds, that were to be of perpetual obligation. They left their views of religion, such as they were; but they left them without any obstacle to their correction and amendment, whenever this should become necessary to accommodate them to the progressive illumination of the human mind. Compare our condition in this respect, with that of the English Establishment, from which our fathers separated. The liberal members of that Church have eight times attempted its reform, but without the least success; so as to justify the strong language used by one of its most distinguished ornaments, as he looked back on these failures, and, in the bitterness of his soul, considered that the cause of them was permanent: "Here, then, hath Terminus fixed his pedestal, and here hath he kept his station for two whole centuries. We are just where the Acts of Uniformity left us, and where, for aught that appears in the temper of the times, the last trumpet will find us."

No, it will not be so. There is a power at work, stronger—infinitely stronger—than the establishments of men, which is trying all establishments, as it were, by fire. They may multiply their creeds and subscriptions, until, to use the language of Milton, "he who would take orders, must subscribe slave, and take an oath withal;" there is that, however, in the *tendencies* of society and the human mind, which tells us that they cannot be for ever resisted. But though creeds and establishments cannot stop the progress of truth, they may, and they will, obstruct its natural and regular progress; and it is because they have not existed in our churches to obstruct the natural and regular progress of truth, that Liberal Christianity has made such advances. It is remarkable of Liberal Christianity in New England, that it is almost entirely of domestic growth. It was not brought here; it has grown up spontaneously. Intelligent and thinking men all over the country, without any concert, and with nothing but the Bible for their guide, have been led to adopt liberal views; in some instances without being aware, at the time, that there were any other persons in the world holding a

similar faith. Nay, I believe it to be undeniable, that wherever all artificial obstructions to free inquiry are removed, Liberal Christianity will spring up spontaneously. Its friends certainly think so; and that its enemies think so too, is proved by the fact of their resorting to these artificial obstructions, avowedly as their only security against its further and universal spread. To account, therefore, for the greater progress which Liberal Christianity has made in New England, than elsewhere, it is only necessary to consider, what all will concede, that there is no other place in the world, where so few artificial obstructions exist to the progress of truth.

I have room to consider but one other cause, which has contributed to make the progress of Liberal Christianity more rapid, and more observable in New England, than elsewhere. It is to be found in the interest taken by the people generally, and especially by the thinking and intelligent part of the community, in theological discussions.

Unhappily in most other places the reading and influential classes bestow but little attention on religious inquiries; either from indifference to the whole subject, or from disgust at the forms under which they commonly hear it presented, or from an impression that these are matters to be left to the clergy for them to manage. But in New England it has always been different. From the beginning, we find the governors, judges, and counsellors mingling with their ministers, and supporting with great ability their own views on points of doctrine and discipline. This, of course, has had the effect to elevate the standard of thought and conversation on religious subjects; and this, again, has stimulated the clergy to greater efforts, that they might bring their preaching up to this standard: so that two good influences have been exerted, and these, also, of a kind to act and re-act perpetually on one another. As a general rule, the preaching in any place will be what public sentiment demands, and never much above what public sentiment demands.

There is, also, another effect, which the interest taken by the laity, in theological discussions, has had on the progress of religious knowledge. We find, that where this subject has occupied the minds, as well as affected the hearts, of laymen, their studies have commonly resulted in their embracing liberal sentiments. I might here refer, if it were necessary, to the immortal names of Newton, Milton,

and Locke, who are known to have given the whole force of their prodigious powers to the investigation of religious truth, and to have rested at last in the adoption of liberal principles. I might also say the same of some of the most distinguished statesmen, and jurists, and general scholars of our own country, living and dead. Nor is it difficult to account for the fact, that the religious inquiries of laymen should more frequently terminate in the adoption of liberal views, than those of the clergy; as laymen must be supposed to be more free from sectarian biases, and to have fewer personal interests to warp the judgment, perhaps unconsciously; and besides, the layman derives an advantage from an intimate acquaintance with the world and human nature, which the divine, with his reserved and recluse habits, can hardly hope to acquire. As, therefore, there is no place in the world where the opinions of laymen have had so much influence in deciding the public mind on the subject of religion, as in New England, we cannot wonder at the prevalence it has given to Liberal Christianity. I may also be permitted to add, that as the testimony of laymen for the truth of Christianity in general, other things being equal, is admitted by all, to be of more weight than the testimony of the clergy, inasmuch as the former cannot be suspected of professional leanings; so, likewise, their testimony for any particular form of Christianity is deserving of the more regard, for the same reason.

The truth is, that the change which has taken place in religious opinions in this quarter, is owing much more to what the people have done, than to what the clergy have done. The clergy, as a body, never yet led the way in improvement, and never will. Here, as elsewhere, the people were before them, and are before them, and probably always will be before them. It is much the fashion with some men not unfriendly, on the whole, to Liberal Christianity, to speak, however, of the change it has introduced, as a great and hazardous experiment. But who are referred to, as trying this experiment?—The clergy? If so, it is contradicted by what we have just said. Besides, it is in no proper sense an experiment, that any body is trying. It is no more an experiment, than the revival of letters was an experiment. It is no more an experiment, than the Reformation under Luther was an experiment. It is no more an experiment, than the American Revolution was an experiment. It is the natural, and I may add, the

necessary consequence of an advanced state of society in every other kind of knowledge, enabling and requiring it to make a corresponding advancement in religious knowledge. It is not the work of passion or caprice, nor the influence of a few powerful individuals, nor any pre-concerted plan of a refined policy; but the natural and necessary result of the progress of the human mind. It is the progress of mind; and this, again, has been carried on by the combined action of a million of causes operating together as certainly and irresistibly as the laws of nature.

Thus do I trace the rise and progress of Liberal Christianity in New England, to the same general causes to which we are also indebted for almost every thing else, that distinguishes our condition as a highly favoured people.

Well may we have confidence in views, that are making progress in the world by such means. And as we profess to hold doctrines, that approach nearer than any others to the instructions of our blessed Lord, let us endeavour to make our characters and our lives approach as much nearer to his example. It has long been felt, that Christianity is destined, in the providence of God, to affect much more directly and powerfully the social and moral condition of mankind, than any of its forms heretofore established have evinced a capacity for doing. If we have found that form which possesses this capacity, let it appear. Let it elevate the tone of moral feeling in the community. Let it save our youth from the pollutions of a sensual life. Let it make the conduct of our men of standing and influence more decidedly religious and Christian. Let it reform and purify the public amusements, which have so much to do in forming the character of a people. Let it increase the abhorrence felt against war, and against all Anti-Christian practices of communities and states. Over all, and above all, let it induce a spirit of humble, ardent, and enlightened piety. Then shall be fulfilled the prediction of our fathers; that in the feeble churches, which they were planting in a strange land, there should spring up a light, such as had never dawned on the corrupt establishments of the old world. Nor will its blessed influences be confined to any kindred, or country, or tongue. But He, who ruleth in the earth, "shall destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations."

Extracts from a Manuscript Address to a Clergyman holding Calvinistic sentiments.—No. 3.

(Concluded from page 41.)

Do you ask whether Christ be not the son of God, in a sense which constituted him the second person in the Trinity? His message to his disciples, seems to afford the proper answer, "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God."* What idea could this language convey to them, but that he stood in the same general relation to the Supreme Being with themselves; that God was alike the God and Father of himself and them? His Apostles, accordingly, understood, that he was "the son of God in the spirit of holiness,"† "of truth and love,"‡ and that in the same moral sense, the whole community of the disciples were "his brethren," among whom he was "the first born."§ There appears, therefore, no more reason to suppose that he partook of the nature and substance of Deity, on account of the filial relation in which he is represented, in Hebrew phraseology, as standing to the one immutable Jehovah, than that the whole community of his disciples, who, in the same phraseology are described as "partakers of the divine nature,"¶ actually partook of the same; or, that James and John were actually "sons of thunder," and Peter "a rock," because they received these appellations. In vain, Sir, will you seek for any expressions analogous to your phrase "god-man," or any ideas corresponding to the doctrine of the two-fold nature, or rather opposition of natures, in the person of Christ. The language of Jesus on this subject, is characterised by the same simplicity as on those just mentioned, "Ye seek to kill me, *a man*, who hath told you the truth which I have heard of God;"‖ Jesus, of Nazareth, says his Apostle, Peter, "*a man* approved (or pointed out to be) of God, by miracles, which God did by him."** "He (God) hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by *that man* whom he hath ordained,"†† saith the great Apostle of the Gentiles. You see, Sir, here is nothing equivocal, nothing even figurative in the terms in which Jesus announces himself, and is announced by his Apostles, to both Jews and

* John xx. 17. † Rom. i. 4. ‡ 2 John, 3. § Rom. viii. 29.
¶ 2 Peter i. 4. ‖ John viii. 40. ** Acts ii. 22. †† Acts xvii. 31.

Gentiles; and as they had no previous knowledge of his character and pretensions, they must have understood him to be no other than the human being he ever appeared, and was thus authoritatively declared to be. Do you ask for a clear distinction, in the words of Jesus or his Apostles, between the one true God, and Jesus his chosen and anointed messenger? Doth he not, in a solemn prayer to the Father, say, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus whom thou hast sent, the Christ."* "There is," saith Paul, "one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."† "To us," says the same Apostle, "there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things."‡ All these passages, convey, in their unequivocal sense, the very ideas avowed by Unitarians, and they are delivered with an explicitness suited to convey the clearest ideas respecting the true object of our worship, and the character and offices of him whom he hath appointed to be "Lord both of the living and the dead." They are also expressed in terms of solemnity and pathos suited to the vast importance of the subject. You have here presented, from the lips and in the actions of Jesus, plain, emphatic proofs, that there exists One only God, the Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, the sole object of adoration, and that Jesus himself is not God, nor an object of prayer, but his humble and fervent worshipper, his chosen messenger, "exalted," indeed, "by him to be a Prince and a Saviour;" and I challenge you to produce a single passage which invalidates, or in any degree alters or qualifies the plain sense of these expressions, or to show that it is either scriptural or possible, that the Father can be God, the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, each of them being distinct persons, and as such, having their several offices, and yet, that there are not three Gods, but one God. To me, it appears perfectly evident, that the Lord Jesus, and his Apostles, with whom all other divinely authorised writers must necessarily agree, most clearly and strongly insist on the acknowledgment and worship of One only God, and that God is "*One Lord*," one divine and equal Father of all those who put their trust in him; and, consequently, that he is one immutable person, the underived and sole

* John xvii. 3. † 1 Tim. ii. 5. ‡ 1 Cor. viii. 6.

Author of all derived and created existences. On the other hand, it is equally evident that you present us with three persons, having three several names and offices assigned to them, and which are, each of them, God; and as such, you separately, as well as unitedly, invoke them in prayer. Two of them, you represent, as derived beings, and as such, essentially distinguished from *Jehovah*, or the self-subsisting God of the Scriptures. In short, Sir, it appears evident to my mind, that you have departed from the plain purport and fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures, by introducing derivative deities as the objects of adoration, and by raising them to an equality with the One true God. You represent the doctrine of three persons in one God, to be an impenetrable mystery; but if you would not depart from your own words, when addressing these persons whom you scruple not, with all the solemnity of devotion, to invoke severally as God, you must state, that there are three Gods in one God, three Almighties in one Almighty, which, I apprehend, is not a mystery, but a contradiction. How endless, Sir, are the labyrinths and perplexities in which we become involved by departing from the plain and fundamental truths of the Scripture, and the plain simplicity of reason, which are perfectly accordant with each other; and I think I have shown, that the consequences of the departure, are no less subversive of the truly catholic and amiable spirit, than they are of the genuine doctrine of the gospel, both of which are acknowledged by all Christians, in words at least, to be really taught and inculcated by it. T. P.

A Summary View of the State of the Argument, on the Historical Evidences of Christianity, between Mr. Beard and his opponents Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor.

(Continued from page 58.)

Mr. C.—Another reason for believing in the existence of Pythagoras, &c. in preference to that of Christ, is, that Pythagoras has an existence by the documents of cotemporaries, which to question would be inexcusable presumption.

Mr. B.—I must confess, I know not where to turn for this documentary evidence. But why do you not, on the principle which you recognise, deem it an inexcusable

presumption to question the existence of Jesus Christ, evidenced by the eye-witnesses, his Apostles? (L. ii. p. 38.)

Mr. C.—You are, however, wrong about the Toldoth Jeschu. It is an answered Jewish production of the 2d century; and, as a proof, it was read by Origen in the 3d.

Mr. B.—This is a kind of proof that I should not have expected from the man who denies that the books of the New Testament existed in the 1st century, because he imagines that they are not referred to until the 2d. But where is the avowal? Now, Origen, even, you say, does "not expressly name this book, but only shows that he was *probably* acquainted with it, as he speaks of Joseph Pandera, and of some other things contained therein." Answer, on your own principles, and say, that the Toldoth Jeschu copied these from Origen; for, when quotations from the Scriptures are adduced as occurring in the Fathers, you reply, the Scriptures are made up of these same quotations from the Fathers. (L. ii. p. 35.)

Mr. C.—But Raymond Martin gives an abstract of it, in the 13th century.

Mr. B.—And, of course, then it existed in the 2d! But what seems to demonstrate the comparatively late origin of the fables of Toldoth Jeschu, and, consequently, of the work itself, is, that the early opponents of Christianity maintain a profound silence respecting both, when no better weapons could they desire with which to combat the rising religion. Neither Trypho the Jew, nor Celsus, nor Porphyry, nor Julian, says Wagenseil (whose confutation of the Toldoth Jeschu you consult), alludes, by the slightest hint, to either the fable or the book. And if this proof of the recentness of the Toldoth Jeschu needed corroboration, it would be supplied by a reference which it makes to the Talmud, in the 5th verse, chap. 1. Now, there are two Talmuds: the Mishna, which is the text, and the Gemara, which is the commentary upon it; the one completed in the 3d, and the other in the 6th century. But the reference is not to the first, as Wagenseil informs us, but to the latter. We now, then, can appreciate the credit due to a book, manifestly composed centuries after the avowed existence of the person whose life and actions it pretends to record—of a book without the name of its author, age, or country. And yet this book is prior to any of the Gospels, we are told (Mr. Carlile's preface), and an avowed Jewish production of the 2d century! (L. ii. pp. 35, 36.)

Mr. C.—All the Gospels, all the Epistles, and all the Revelations, were written in the Greek language.

Mr. B.—Learned men have decided, on the best evidence, that the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Gospel by Matthew, were originally in Hebrew, because they were addressed to Jews, who read, though they did not speak, Hebrew. But it would have been absurd to write in Hebrew to the Romans and Corinthians, who were utterly ignorant of the language. Josephus, a Jew, wrote his works not in Hebrew but in Greek, that they might make their way among all nations. And for the same reason, the books of the New Testament were written in Greek. Would it not be absurd, to reject the testimony, and deny the existence of Josephus, because he wrote in this language? It remains for you to show, why, what is absurd in reference to Josephus, is justifiable in reference to Christianity. (L. i. p. 7.)

Mr. C.—I make a distinction between Josephus and the Disciples: the first was schooled in foreign literature; the latter, could only know the language of their immediate neighbourhood.

Mr. B.—But you have not proved that that language was exclusively Hebrew, or Chaldee, or Aramean. That persons, however, of their rank in society, might use the Greek language, is proved by a variety of authorities; by the learned Wetstein, who says, "The Greek language at that time, was much used throughout the whole Roman Empire, and particularly in Judea." By Dr. Jortin, "In the time of Christ and his Apostles, the Greek was really the universal language." By Dr. Campbell, "The Greek was, of all languages, the best understood, and the most generally spoken throughout the Roman Empire." By Michaelis, "The true reason why the greatest part of the New Testament was written in Greek, is simply this, because that was the language best understood, both by writers and readers." By Bishop Marsh, who informs us, that Greek was spoken in the cities of Galatia, though *it was not the language of that* country, and that the Alexandrine Greek version of the Old Testament was used in the synagogues of Judea. And by Cicero, Josephus, and Juvenal. There is no propriety, then, in the distinction which you have made between Josephus and the writers of the New Testament. They wrote in Greek, because they both knew it and spoke it, and because it

was the language which would secure to their productions the widest circulation. (L. ii. pp. 43, 44.)

Mr. C.—I care not in what dialect your books were written.

Mr. B.—It may be so; but a difficulty is not dispatched by a determination to care nothing about it. The argument in favour of the credibility of the New Testament, derived from its peculiar language, is worthy a careful consideration; and the more it is scrutinized, the more powerful evidence will it afford, that the books of the New Testament were composed chiefly before the destruction of Jerusalem. (L. ii. p. 40.)

Mr. C.—From the year 70, A. D. *viz.* the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, to the predominance of the Christian religion, under the Roman Emperors, we have no history of Jerusalem.

Mr. B.—In the interval you make, you adduce a *fact*. There *was* history therefore; for no facts could be recorded without history. But Dr. Priestley, in his Church History, vol. I. informs us, that the Jews were not entirely quelled, nor was Judea emptied of all its inhabitants, till the time of Adrian, who began his reign 138 after Christ. Under Trajan (117), we find that L. Quietus, on account of a victory gained over the Jews, was made governor of Judea. So much for your assertion, that we have no history of the interval defined by yourself. And from the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, down to the time in which you allow Christianity existed (120), no new sects could have arisen near Jerusalem. It was not a period of repose, but of war and bloodshed. There was not then an opportunity for the rise of any new sect. The Romans, the enemies of the Jews, would most easily have contradicted any fabrication, the scenes of which were laid among themselves. (L. i. pp. 7, 8.)

Mr. C.—But a Grecian fabulist, thirty years after the fall of Jerusalem, set his head to work, to lay in Jerusalem the scenes of the fable; and no one could contradict him.

Mr. B.—Pray, good Sir, tell us his name, his residence, his reward, &c. This fabulist, I think, you must allow, must have been possessed of a mind of the very first order, to conceive and delineate the character of Jesus Christ, with such perfect artlessness and consistency; to originate and develope the system of Gospel morality; and to scatter through his fabrication, so many indications, powerful, because apparently undesigned, of reality and truth. Is

it not strange that this gifted mortal was never heard of? But what difficulty could there be in overwhelming with the conviction of his turpitude, the wretched author of this supposed fabrication? How easy for the Jews, myriads of whom were saved from destruction under the walls of Jerusalem, to arrest the very first efforts for the diffusion of the base falsehood! (L. i. pp. 8–10.)

Mr. C.—No one would think this imposture worthy of notice, till it had begun to spread widely.

Mr. B.—The time you fix for its rise, is 100, A. D. Strange to say, then, it began to spread widely very soon. For in the year 106, Pliny thought it not only worthy of his notice, but worthy of the attention of the Emperor Trajan also. And no later than 138, was it, when your learned ally Celsus thought it worthy of *his* notice. Lynx-eyed as he was, however, he could not pierce the mist of *eight-and-thirty* years, and discover your imaginary fabulist! Though nearly, if not quite contemporary with him, yet search as he might, never could he gain a glimpse of him, or hear even the echo of his name. (L. i. pp. 10, 11.

Mr. C.—Celsus only attacked the physical absurdities of Christianity, not its history.

Mr. B.—This is not a little curious if it be true. An exposure of the recent fabrication of Christianity, would have saved him the trouble of refuting its physical defects. Surely the readiest way was to strike at the root at once, and not to waste time in lopping the branches, one by one. Supposing then, as you say, that he has not attacked its history, the plain reason is, because *he could not*, not because he *would* not; for if he had had the means, he would have been induced to use them, by the facility and completeness of the undertaking. (L. ii. p. 42.)

(To be Continued.)

The Teachings of Nature and Orthodoxy contrasted.

(Concluded from page 48.)

Such are the truths unfolded by the Volume of Nature, such the delineations of the Creator's power, such the peerless attributes with which he is therein invested. They are illustrated and established by that other Volume, containing a Revelation of Himself and his will, where his refulgent glories are even more clearly portrayed, and his high supremacy distinctly defined and revealed.

Yet, that Revelation is so read by many Christians, as to deduce from its perusal very opposite consequences; but then they are Christians, who have learned Christ under the tuition of what is called *Orthodoxy*—Orthodoxy, which, by an unhallowed combination of scholastic philosophy and monkish reveries with the system of the Saviour, has converted the Gospel scheme of salvation into a tissue of contradictory mysteries. And these mysteries are propounded to the quiescent multitude, according to the caprice, creed, ignorance, or interest of the various priests of mystery; and casually varied, according to the class to which they severally belong, whether established, endowed, or dissenting.

One grand dogma, however, is the doctrine of the Trinity, said to be a Christian doctrine, though not taught by Christ—an Apostolic doctrine, though unknown to the Apostles—an Evangelic doctrine, though in vain will it be sought for in the Evangelists; but a doctrine, nevertheless, assumed to be a fundamental of Christian faith, and a denial of which, according to some of its advocates, is punishable with everlasting damnation!

Yet the various explanations with which the world has been favoured, are so conflicting and contradictory, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to adopt a generally satisfactory standard. By the Church of England, the dogma is very fearlessly and explicitly stated, and it cannot be denied but that she is to multitudes an unquestionable authority in matters of faith, being preceded and excelled only by the Papal chair, is intimately connected with the temporalities of a powerful kingdom, and maintains a most imposing station in the possession of enormous wealth, princely honours, towering dignities, and irresponsible power.

According, then, to her ritual, "there is but One living and true God, everlasting, without *body, parts,* or *passions;* of infinite power, wisdom and goodness, the Maker and Preserver of all things, both visible and invisible." So far excellent, rational, and scriptural. "And in the *unity* of this Godhead, there be *three* persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."—Vide Article I. Furthermore the Son, or God the Son, "of *one substance with* the Father," "truly suffered, was *crucified, dead,* and *buried,*" &c.—Article II. The Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland, re-echoes these appalling sentiments.

These principles are even more decisively and emphatically stated in that part of the ritual of the Churches of Rome and England, called the Creed of St. Athanasius, where we are taught, that the Son, who possesses an equal glory, a co-eternal majesty with the Father, who is uncreated, incomprehensible, eternal, and Almighty, suffered for our salvation, descended into Hell, rose from the dead, ascended into Heaven! The same Creed teaches, that, notwithstanding, there is but *One* eternal, *One* uncreated, *One* incomprehensible, *One* Almighty, *One* God!

The consequence is evident:—The Almighty Spirit of nature, the Creator and Supporter of the universe, and of all which it contains, the extent of whose power we cannot comprehend, descended upon this earth for the salvation of the human race, who are as grasshoppers before him, yea, less than the small dust of the balance! To accomplish this, it was necessary for him to be born, to grow in stature, to be tempted, tried, pass through scenes of tribulation and anguish, and finally cease to exist! Is not such a representation obviously inconsistent? Who that thinks at all, is not conscious of its impossibility? But supposing it possible, is it not highly improbable, that He, who by his power sustains myriads of inhabited worlds, and myriads upon myriads of intelligent creatures, should select this atom, this fraction of creation, here to expire for the salvation of beings, probably of the lowest order of intellectual existence? Does not the manifest incongruity of the system, induce a belief, that it is not—cannot be true; that it derogates from the dignity of the Almighty, is in direct contradiction to his attributes, is totally uncalled for by circumstances or situation, and is, consequently, inconclusive, irrational, and unscriptural?

There cannot be more than One Eternal, Self-existent, Omnipotent, Supreme. The supposition of more than One, involves the destruction of those attributes which can only exist connected with ubiquity. There can be only One Almighty God. Different, far different are the dogmas of reputed Orthodoxy, as advanced by her champions, and sung by her poets; as the following verses, the production of an Oxford Professor, will bear melancholy witness. Let our readers recollect, that they are addressed to that Being whom Mr. Millman worships as his God:—

> They bound thy temples with the twisted thorn,
> Thy bruised feet went languid on with pain;

The blood from all thy flesh with scourges torn,
Deepen'd thy robe of mockery's crimson grain;
Whose native vesture bright
Was the unapproached light,
The sandal of whose foot, the rapid hurricane!

Low bow'd thy head convuls'd, and droop'd in death;
Thy voice sent forth a sad and wailing cry;
Slow struggled from thy breast the parting breath,
And every limb was wrung with agony:
That head whose veilless blaze
Fill'd Angels with amaze,
When at that voice sprang forth the rolling suns on high!

And thou wert laid within the narrow tomb,
Thy clay-cold limbs with shrouding grave-clothes bound;
The sealed stone confirm'd thy mortal doom,
Lone watchmen walk'd *thy* desert burial-ground,
Whom Heaven could not contain,
Nor the immeasurable plain
Of vast infinity enclose or circle round!

What follows, but that HE whom no man hath seen, or can see, appeared on earth—the immutable God became an infant at the breast—the Almighty Ruler of all, was cradled in a manger—He who provideth for every living thing its sustenance, was assailed with hunger and thirst—the Creator and Preserver of the world had not where to lay his head—that He was teazed by the malicious plottings, and grieved at the malevolent revilings of intriguing priests and rulers—that in the garden of Gethsamane, He was in such anguish and distress, as to sweat as it were blood—that the Supreme Being was strengthened and supported by an Angel—that He underwent a mock trial, was scourged by a licentious soldiery, amidst bitter taunts and insulting contumely—that He bore an instrument of execution to a place of public obloquy, to be crucified amongst the outcasts from society—that he was nailed by mortal hands to the Cross, and upon which the eternal Jehovah, whose throne is heaven, and the earth his foot-stool, He who looketh to the ends of the world, and seeth under the whole heaven, "the Sovereign Ruler of the world, its Almighty Protector, its Omniscient and Omnipresent Governor, its Eternal, Immutable, and All-sufficient Creator," the great I AM—the Self-existent God, expired in agony!!

Such, if words have any meaning, such is the conclusion which indubitably follows from the common doctrines of the Trinity, and vicarious sacrifice. As here stated, it is unvarnished, not obscured by mystical glosses nor perverted by sophistical ingenuity. Thus plainly expressed, it might be asked, Can any man adopt this conclusion as his faith—

his sincere and practical belief? Can any deliberately receive and avow it, without reservation or evasion? It might be supposed, that to entertain such ideas of the very and eternal God, as to imagine he was born, suffered, and expired, could not be held even for a moment. But it must not be forgotten, that the Established Churches of Christendom, peremptorily teach this opinion, if their Creeds, Formularies, and Confessions, have any meaning. The Church of England especially, thus invokes the King of kings, the ever-blessed Jehovah, nay, the whole and undivided Trinity: "By the mystery of thy holy incarnation, by thy holy nativity and circumcision, by thy baptism, fasting, and temptation, by thine agony and bloody sweat, by thy cross and passion, by thy precious *death* and *burial*, by thy glorious resurrection and ascension, good Lord deliver us."—*Vide Litany.*

This adjuration, be it ever remembered, is not addressed to a fractional part of Deity, the manhood of the God. That much lauded master-key, which so facilely passes all the intricate locks of Platonic Theology, here loses its potency, for the prayer is addressed to the "*Holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity,* THREE *persons* and ONE *God.*" Either the language just quoted, is used of God, or it is not. If it is, that Being who alone possesseth immortality, is said to have expired in torments on the accursed tree! If it be only addressed to man, then Christ is not God, and the doctrine of the Trinity crumbles into dust.

The man who embraces opinions consonant with the Holy Scriptures, looks up to God as an uncontrolled, but all-controlling mind—the Creator. He regards, not as mysteries, but contradictions, the conclusions, that "HE who is at all times present in every part of the universe, was circumscribed by a human body," and wrapped in swaddling clothes a puling helpless infant—that "He who alone hath immortality, was raised from the dead by the Spirit—He who dwelleth in light inaccessible, whom no man can see, and live, was yet seen, and reviled, and buffeted, and scourged by men." "He who is the blessed God, was received up into glory!"*—that He who created millions and millions of worlds, all peopled with different ranks and orders of existence, should appear in a human form upon this earth, and here expire in agony, in order

* Unitarianism the doctrine of the Gospel, by Lant Carpenter, LL. D.

to accomplish the salvation of man, a part of whom only, are, after all this infinity of sacrifice, accepted and saved!

Such a man, too, concludes, that if the Deity had really expired on the cross, instead merely of the sun being darkened, the vail of the Temple rent, the earth quaking, and the graves opening—instead of this, if the sun had been instantaneously extinguished, and the earth had crumbled to powder, and the stars neglecting their orbits, had spread a general conflagration—if disorder and confusion had overwhelmed the universe, and thick darkness overspread the face of nature, and chaos, destruction, ruin, been everywhere enthroned, it would not have been inconsistent with the expiring moments of a God. Nay, if such an event had taken place, the annihilation of all existence, would immediately and necessarily have ensued.

Viewing this earth as a part only of creation, the practical Christian considers the works of God, to consist of countless numbers of suns, attended by an infinity of worlds, keeping their allotted courses with harmonious regularity, and peopled with intelligent beings, formed for endless progression, felicity, and perfection. He believes, that the Almighty Architect raised up in this world, a chosen prophet, Jesus Christ the righteous, to reveal his will, his unbounded beneficence and mercy, the future life allotted to man, and his situation there, governed by his conduct in this. He receives Jesus as his Saviour, the Saviour of *this* world, who, by submitting to death, even the death of the cross, was enabled to demonstrate the truth of his mission, brought life and immortality to light, and thus tasted death for every man. Thus does the Christian receive his Saviour as a blessed gift, from a heavenly Father, and through that Saviour, by whom he is made a partaker in the blessings of Gospel truth, he acknowledges with joy and gratitude, that Father to be the blessed and only Potentate, who alone possesseth immortality, whom no man can approach unto, hath seen, or can see, and to Him only does he ascribe glory, honour, and everlasting power. S.

On the Language of Scripture.

(Continued from page 67.)

John xx. 28, *And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord, and my God.* This passage is called, by Trini-

tarians, an irrefragable argument of the deity of our blessed Lord. A high Arian naturally appeals to it in support of his system. Could he establish the truth of his doctrines on other passages of Scripture, the exclamation of Thomas might, without any violence to the language of Revelation, be adduced in confirmation. But, it certainly gives no countenance to the doctrine of the Trinity, and is irrelevantly urged in support of this most mysterious and astounding creed. The high Arian may fix upon it, and cling to it, if he can show that his interpretation harmonizes with other passages of Scripture. This we deny. In our opinion, the voice of Revelation cries out against the common explanation. We believe, that Christ and his Apostles partook of the same spirit, and teach the same doctrines. All apparent discrepancies, with respect to doctrine, may be reconciled by a candid, liberal, and rational mode of interpretation. We know, that, in many passages, Jesus Christ is mentioned as a man, made, in all respects, like unto his brethren; we know, that he partook of the natural infirmities of human nature—that he suffered exhaustion of spirits, weariness of body, hunger and thirst—that he was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief—that his mind was influenced with the various affections of human nature—that he wept, groaned in spirit—that he rejoiced, was moved with indignation, was in an agony —that he was tempted like as we are—that he prayed, and died, and was raised from the dead by the power of God. The Scriptures contain many declarations respecting the humanity of Jesus Christ, his natural inability, ignorance, and weakness. The Baptist declares, "After me cometh a man who is preferred before me," John i. 30. Jesus says of himself, "Ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God," John viii. 40. "The Son can do nothing of himself." "I can of mine own self do nothing." "My doctrine is not mine." "My Father is greater than I." "Neither came I of myself, but he sent me." "I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." These passages, and many more of the same kind might be adduced, concur with the general tenor of Scripture, in proving to our satisfaction, that Christ is not God. Believing that the Sacred Records are uniformly consistent, we adopt the plan of explaining dark passages by the light of the general tenor of Revelation. Difficult texts,

which apparently contravene the plainest declarations and the uniform drift of the Bible, we carefully examine, and endeavour to explain, without wresting them, to convey a rational and consistent meaning. If Christ was a man approved of God, he could not be the Eternal God. If the Father was greater than he, he could not be equal with the Father. If Christ died, he could not be the Immortal God. If Christ was tempted, he could not be God, for God cannot be tempted with evil. If, then, Thomas called Christ God, he must have used the word in the inferior sense in which it is sometimes employed in the Scriptures. See Christian Pioneer, vol. i. p. 328.

It appears to us, that there are two distinct exclamations, addressed to different persons. The incredulous Apostle's doubts in a moment vanish. The delightful but astonishing truth flashes across his mind. A crowd of thoughts rush into his head, and he exclaims, in the perturbation of the moment, My Lord! and My God! first addressing himself to Christ:—it is indeed a fact, thou art in reality my honoured Master, whom I saw expire on the cross; then, full of pious gratitude to that great Being, to whom alone the Jews ascribed all their blessings, his thoughts were immediately, from the force of habit, turned in grateful adoration to Him by whose Almighty power, Jesus was raised from the dead. We shall take the liberty of expressing our thoughts on this text, in the words of Mr. Fox, addressed to Dr. Blomfield, the present Bishop of Chester.*

"On receiving the palpable proof which he had required, of the resurrection of Christ, Thomas exclaimed, 'My Lord!' and my God!' I agree with you, that the first exclamation, my Lord! refers to Christ. You say, 'we can hardly' (I think we may easily) 'separate the two' exclamations, as I shall term them; for that they are 'two members of a sentence,' is a gratuitous assumption on your part. Their division is perfectly natural, because they correspond with the emotions which would, in the most rapid succession, be excited towards different objects in the Apostle's mind. By the first, he recognises the identity of Christ; and in the second, he reverences the power

* The Apostle John a Unitarian, a Letter to the Rev. C. J. Blomfield, D. D. occasioned by his five lectures on the Gospel of St. John.—By W. J. Fox. We strongly recommend this pamphlet to our readers.

of God, who had raised him from the dead. Were you, Sir, visited by some friend whom you had seen committed to the tomb, your feelings would, I think, on receiving a similar proof of identity, flow in the same course, and with the same rapidity. In the first moment of astonished conviction, you would call him by his name; your immediately succeeding feeling would be, an adoring gratitude towards the Almighty Author of the change. The coupling together of two exclamations, addressed to different persons, without noticing that circumstance, the terms being supposed to explain themselves, is analogous to the quotation of expressions from different passages, united in a similar way. Thus, Acts i. 20, 'It is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein, and his bishopric let another take.' The first is from Psalm lxix. the latter from Psalm cix. There is as much plausibility in their being a continued sentiment, as in the speech of Thomas being a continued address to the same person."

(To be Continued.)

Poetry.

My spirit mingled with the wind,
And threaded through the maze of air,
Through ether was diffused my mind;
God was not there!

I plung'd beneath the world of waves,
By light of mermaid's shining hair
I sought the depths of ocean's caves;
God was not there!

I sought the bowels of the earth,
Where gems shine forth so bright and fair,
Where gushing streamlets have their birth;
God was not there!

I sought the forest depths profound,
Where never hart from midnight lair
Was startled by the bay of hound;
God was not there!

I sought beyond the farthest star
That ever to our nether earth
Sheds forth its beams of light from far;
God was not there!

I sought within the lurid sheet
Of fire's purest, brightest glare,
I shone enrobed with rustling heat;
God was not there!

The earth and all its scenes so light,
With all its gems so rich and rare,
I left for regions of the night;
God was not there!

Yes, yes, I wander'd through the grave—
I sought the "City of Despair,"
I rode o'er Time's expanse of wave;
God was not there!

Vain spirit! didst thou idly dream,
By searching, then, to find
The Omnipresent God Supreme,
To elements confined?

Go search, and see
The fathomless sea!
Go look and find
The wings of wind!
Go near and gaze,
The starry maze!
Go, in thy pride,
The earth and stride!
Go! read their wonders; then unfold
Their secret powers—construction rare!
And when of each its parts are told,
Then canst thou say,—God is not there?

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *November* 1, 1827.

MR. DAVID LOGAN, whose death we noticed in our June No. p. 396, was, early in life, destined for the Christian ministry, in the Church of Scotland. For the accomplishment of this purpose, he entered the University of Glasgow. At the age of sixteen, however, his benevolent heart had revolted at the doctrine of never-ending-torments, and he appears to have imbibed the opinions advocated by the Rev. Niel Douglas, at that period the Universalist Minister of this city. In a letter to a friend, dated

25th Dec. 1817, he vindicates Mr. Douglas from the charge of being an impostor, and happily replies to the charge, that the doctrine of God's unbounded love was a disgrace to Scotland:

"All Impostors, in all ages and countries, have consulted public feeling, and have accommodated to popular prejudice. They never attempt to reform or emancipate from error. They ever augment the potion. Instead of attacking prejudice, they soothe it—instead of insulting preconception, they flatter it, and thus a Mahomet can have a whole continent of dupes, and a "Pretender Messiah," can have a whole army of deluded enthusiastics, with but a little crafty address and artful management, at pleasure. Mr. Douglas, however, must be allowed to be an exception to the general run of Impostors. He ridicules the prejudice of reputed orthodoxy, he wounds the feelings of the bigot, and he bites the crafty system-monger. The Arminian he pronounces inconsistent—the Calvinist, he calls cruel—and the Infidel he declares is inexcusable. The first, because his God is impotent; the second, because his God is implacable; and the third, because he will not embrace a system that reconciles these contradictions, that harmonizes the Scriptures, and that displays the genuine amiableness of the perfections of God. All parties thus combine against him, from the Atheist to that paragon of infallibility, the Covenanter; and if insincere and unconscientious, in a word, if an Impostor, why does he revolt from current prejudices, and incur popular obloquy and disadvantage—why?—To preserve 'a conscience void of offence, towards God and towards Man.'

"'The disgrace of a covenanted nation!' Who made the covenant with you? Was it God? Alas! you are covenanted against Truth and Free Inquiry. Before God and Man you swear, that you will defend with your blood, the articles of your confession; and pray, who revealed to you, that these articles are infallible truths, or who authorised you to monopolise truth? Nothing short of a revelation from heaven, could suggest the marvellous supposition, that Truth when it found John Calvin, received its consummation; and that the Covenanters so totally finished the building of the 'edification of the body of Christ,' as to furnish no scope for subsequent augmentation, or subsequent improvement. But had John this communication from Heaven? Did he show the credentials of a divine mission? The man who persecuted, imprisoned, tortured, burned, a poor dissenter from orthodoxy, of the name of Servetus, seems the last man in the world to have had converse with a God of infinite love and infinite justice.'"

David Logan, had, indeed, no fear of man before his eyes. Pursuing his inquiries with all the ardour which a love of truth can alone inspire, the scales of Orthodox prejudice gradually dropped from before his mind, and he embraced with fervour, the principles of Christian Unitarianism. The pleadings of nature, and the solicitations of worldly comfort, and the prospect of worldly respectability, stifled not in him the still small voice of conscience. Unmindful either of the world's smile, or the world's frown, he felt that One God is rather to be followed, than in-

numerable worlds of men,—that, though the applause of the multitude might not be his, and his most earnest efforts might prove unavailing to roll back the tide of error,—and though men of the world, might affect to pity his enthusiasm, and the indifferentist might sneer, and the bigot scowl, yet that there was an eye that would mark the humble labourer of righteousness; and, cheered by these thoughts, he openly professed what he believed, and put forth his hand to the plough of duty. Mr. Logan was ever ready to assist in the various services in the Chapel at Glasgow, or in the neighbouring places; and in January 1822, was settled as minister to the congregation at Port-Glasgow. The anticipations of success which had been formed, were unhappily not realized, and in 1823, he accepted an invitation to Dundee. Here he published the Address, delivered at the entrance of his ministry amongst them. We would gladly make several extracts from this admirable publication, but must content ourselves with the introductory paragraph of the preface.

"The author of the following discourse, and defence of Unitarianism, is not a hereditary Unitarian. He is a convert. The renouncement of the doctrine of the Trinity cost him many pangs. It was the faith of his fathers—the faith which he cherished—the faith which men hoped he would defend—and glad would he have been, when he began to suspect its erroneousness, if he could have excused himself from an impartial inquiry into the evidences of the opposite doctrine. But this he could not do. A strong suspicion that all was not right in his creed, having been excited in his mind, by a cause from which one would not have anticipated such an effect—excited by an orthodox sermon—he could not stifle it as some can do, by calling it a temptation of Satan, or by some other convenient expedient. He felt himself bound to inquire. He did inquire, and the result was, what some call heresy, and what I call truth.

"But, besides the duty of inquiry, he felt that he had another duty to perform—that of avowing his belief. This duty also he performed; and though poverty was before him—though obloquy was before him—though it grieved him to thwart a father's wishes, who, having conducted him through eight sessions of education in the University of Glasgow, was now so near the close of the long preparation, to be so painfully disappointed, he nevertheless became a Unitarian preacher; and now, as a defender of Unitarianism, he calls upon his Trinitarian countrymen, as Christians, to 'search the Scriptures,'—as Protestants, to scorn subjection to human authority, to be manly in the exercise of their own understandings—to be unprejudiced, that if his be the truth, they may embrace it, and that if theirs be the truth, they may with some reason reject his error."

The reviewer of this little work, in the Monthly Repository, vol. xviii. p. 663, fully joined in the anticipations which others entertained. "We wholly mistake it, if it does not mark out its author, as destined to great usefulness in the Christian Church." There were, however, some peculiarities about Mr. Logan, which

operated against his usefulness. We cannot but think, that had these been properly and early pointed out, by the advice of judicious and serious friendship, they would soon have been removed. To such advice we are convinced he would readily have listened; and instead of being made the occasion of ill-timed laughter, he would have accomplished the best wishes of all sincere friends of truth and integrity. His labours at Dundee not being crowned with success, he was *obliged*, though decidedly against his own wishes, to relinquish the ministry, and to complete his studies for the medical profession, on some of which he had previously entered. To those studies he applied himself with all his characteristic ardour;—he had just finished them, and was looking forward to a zealous discharge of public duties, as a Surgeon. On one of his professional visits, a patient afflicted with a virulent fever, who was too poor to employ a barber to shave his head, excited the wonted benevolence of Mr. Logan, and he performed the operation himself. From that moment he sickened. When confined to his chamber, he received the last public testimony of the approval of his companions in study, in the second prize of the class to which he belonged; and in a few days afterwards, his mortal career of usefulness and virtue was stopped. He rests in earth. Yes, and of him it may with truth, we believe, be said, that though young in years (26), he was old in the practice of duty, the adherence to principle, the manifestation of benevolence. Honourable age is not that alone which standeth in length of time, nor that which is measured by number of years; wisdom is the grey hair unto man, and an unspotted life is old age. For as much as it was in the heart of our departed friend to build a house for God's name and honour and glory, he did well that it was in his heart.

THE following letter arrived too late for insertion in our last Number. Were we to consult our own taste, we confess we should decline inserting any address to the Rev. Henry Cooke. That individual has already exhibited himself "*usque ad nauseam*" before the public eye, that, to any judgment not perverted by bigotry, his intolerance must be perfectly harmless. As far, too, as the Christian Pioneer is concerned, we are under some obligation to the Divine of Killileagh. His denunciation has saved us some expense, and has made our Magazine much better known than it was previously. So far we are indebted to him. As, however, it is well that those who claim *infallibility*, should be called on to produce their patent—as it is right, that the *causes* of religious malevolence should be laid open—as it is fit, that those who pin their faith upon *his* sleeve, "should be shown what an arguer he is, and how well he deserves for his performance, to be dubbed by himself irrefragable"—as, in the opinion of numbers, he is now riding the topmost wave of popularity—and as "It is the *bright* day which brings forth the *adder*, and that craves wary walking," we direct the attention of our readers to the following letter.

To Mr. Cooke.

Sir,

The Pioneer has traversed broader waters than those which separate the Scotch and Irish shores. By your own account ("though with no friendly view"), you have marked its progress through your native land. I have no doubt, therefore, that this Number will soon meet your eye:—would, that, in the spirit of benevolent prophecy, I could say, that its contents will reach your heart. But, Sir, I am no enthusiast. That very reason, which, in matters of religion, you so loudly decry, forces on me, at this moment, a melancholy distrust in the efficacy of an appeal to one constituted like you. The hope which at present animates me to the task, is its influence on the public.

Your *instinctive* discovery of error in what formerly rendered you so amiable to your associates—your intimacy with one well connected in the world, who may prove serviceable to your *interest*, and that of your family—and the prospect of being a ruler among the tents of the holy, have led me to conjecture, that perhaps a self-deception has warped your understanding, which the progress of events, and the expostulations of friends, might in time disentangle. Of your *talents* no *enemy* can doubt; your *honesty* and *sincerity* should be dear to your *friends*.

My only fear is, that, by giving you so much apparent consequence in the eyes of the religious world, as thus putting you in the foreground of a publication of merit, the seeds of spiritual vanity, which I wish to weed out, may be more deeply rooted, and the fruit thereof encouraged to a larger growth. But, in the moments of your more sober reflection, if they are not entirely drowned by self-deception, self-interest, or fanaticism, you must feel convinced, that such a feeling of self-complacency would only resemble the pride of the culprit, who gloried in the elevation, which bore to his ears denunciations against the violator of the rights of humanity.

I have said that the *instinctive rapidity* with which you discovered your error, led me to doubt the stability of the principle on which such a change in your conduct was founded. Your expression, as recorded with a pen of iron, in "pages" which will descend to your children, is, "that your connexion with Arians had left such deep wounds in your conscience, as nothing but the *blood of Christ*, and the Spirit of the Holy Ghost could heal." The best wish that I can form, for the redemption of your character, and for the peace with which you should leave a conflicting world, is, that you will leave behind you a document steeped in tears, calling on the same awful agencies, to blot out a sentiment which the demon of discord would be proud to patronize.

I have heard it asserted, I know not how truly, that you consider yourself a second Calvin, born to regenerate the world. Were I assured that your character was that of a mere fanatic or enthusiast, I could, in the spirit of Christian pity, make allowance for the ravings of a disordered imagination; but, when I reflect upon the uniform tenor of your sentiments and conduct, in a long intercourse with those who had a right to know you well—when I consider the period and the circumstances under which the mighty mental change was wrought—I cannot help fearing, in common with your best well-wishers, that this self-deception, if such it be, has been superinduced by *temporal* and not by *spiritual* agency. Lest, however, I should be mistaken, and that some spiritual Quixotism may have usurped that breast, *once* the seat of liberality and Christian charity, I will, in despite of my fears, make an appeal to that understanding, which cannot, without a visitation of Providence, be exiled for ever.

Cooke and Calvin! Could you, even at the greatest acme of your spiritual mania, ever suppose that those two names should go down to

posterity in the same leaf of remembrance together. Yours will indeed descend, not in ecclesiastical history, but in the dusty tome of synodical minutes, to be tumbled over hereafter, by some youthful aspirant, who anxiously seeks for a legitimate warrant to break through the bonds of Christian fellowship, and usher inquisitorial terrors into the bosom of his church.

The days in which *you* live, and those in which *Calvin* flourished, are widely different. Calvin came forward at a time, when Egyptian darkness overshadowed the soul of man. Cooke lives in an age, in which the spark of free inquiry, kindled by that reformer, has very widely illumined the land. Calvin, fostered in the bosom of a church, whose canker he afterwards unbared, fettered by chains which he successfully wrung from himself and his followers, shone like a beacon on some dangerous shore, when safety seemed lost to the benighted mariner. Cooke, living in the bosom of a *doubly* reformed Church, at a time when the principles of civil and religious liberty are fearlessly espoused, attempts to forge again the fetters upon private judgment, so *many links* of which his idol Calvin broke. Calvin, in his *benighted* age, with so many early prejudices still lurking round his heart, could not, in the nature of things, proceed much further to emancipate the mind. *You*, Sir, in an *enlightened* age, when freed from the thraldom of those impositions against which he warred—when the charter of the Christian, the Holy Scriptures, is in every temple and on every pillow—you rudely rush forward in a bitter zeal, stamp the signet of *infallibility* on your own creed, fulminate bulls of excommunication against your brethren, and strive, by your spiritual wand, to convert the 19th into the 15th century!

You have, I trust, mistaken the era calculated for such an exhibition. Were I disposed to imitate the caustic humour which you frequently employ, I might say, that it resembles the pageantry of the "Champion of England" at the Coronation of our King. The chivalric costume, the trappings, and the prancing of the steed, are in proper keeping, but the period and arena for his "deeds of daring" are "past and flown."

The Synod of Ulster, prior to your crusade, was united in the beautiful spirit of fellowship and peace. The oil of Christian toleration had been poured over the waters, which, at a troubled season had separated its members. Under the influence of this spirit, many of the ministers returned to its communion, and a mere cobweb of form restrained the remainder. The whirlwind of 1726 was deprecated by all, and a bond of mutual toleration seemed in practice to be signed by every hand. The aged Ministers kept the imperativeness of subscription to creeds in abeyance; and the young Ministers came, light of heart and conscience, to an assembly begun and terminated in Christian fellowship and social harmony. No banner of religious animosity was then unfurled. For many a year, during the sittings of the Synod of Ulster, a club existed, of which *you* were a member, formed for the promotion of unity and concord; and from which a diversity in religious opinion caused no exclusion—the talented, and witty, and innocent "*Spiritual Club.*"

In an evil hour for the interest of Presbyterianism, and, let me add, for your own character, you hearkened to a call from the congregation of Killileagh. From that moment, what appeared to your friends an *almost* supernatural change in your character was wrought. You will no doubt attribute this to a call from above, which the dense atmosphere of Donegore was unable to transmit to your ears. Instead of your former frank communion with your Arian friends, came diffidence and distrust—instead of the mildness of a Melancthon, came the scowl of an "exclusive"—instead of that philanthropy of sentiment, that unreserved honesty of brotherly communion, which rendered you so estimable in the eyes of your friends, came the intrigues of a polemic, the persecution of an inquisitor, and the bearing of a would-be martyr. "Within a

month, a little month—Oh let me not think"—An overwhelming desire now seemed to creep through every vein, of appearing as a beacon on the height of public opinion. It was a phosphoric disease, which rapidly spread in proportion to your unceasing wanderings. A crusade against the *Catholic* Church soon dwindled into insignificance, when compared with the glory to be earned by heading the hue and cry of *heresy* in your *own*. To stand at the door of Zion, waving the blazing sword of repulsion before the rebels of your creed, was the commission you at length assumed in the church militant upon earth. In England, amid the ruins of a church, the errors of which your favourite, Calvin, withstood, the emblematic sculpture over two doors of the confessional still remain. Over the one by which the confessing entered, is the image of a swine; over the other, by which they departed, is that of a dove. Your confessional, erected for sinning Arians, in your address to the Synod of Munster, is on a similar construction:—Repent!! "Newton, Locke, and Clarke, bow down your heads! enter through the door allotted for the unworthy, and *I* will shrive you! Cast away that abominable heresy which led you to open the Gospel, and differ from Calvin; and having passed through the purifying medium of my crucible, though you entered with the impurities of the swine, you shall depart with the innocence of the dove!"

A strong corroboration of the popular idea, that you conceive yourself set apart, under Providence, as a regenerator of the Christian Church, is, your answer to the dignified and temperate exposition of the Munster Synod. The Cobbet-like style you have therein adopted, the hackneyed quaintness of your Latin Billingsgate, and the mixture of pharisaical pride with affected Christian humility, is alike highly discreditable to your principles and to your taste. Too much of *earth* remains about the heart from which it flowed, to qualify you for the self-assumed character of an infallible guide to *heaven*. To mingle in the same page, the pertness of the polemic with the prostration of the saint, the writhings of human irritability with the lowly bow of sanctified humility, may characterize the demagogue who grasps through every hazard at a name, but destroys your pretensions to the character you would assume.

Be assured, that an ill-regulated ambition will be attended in your case, as in every other, by a re-action fatal to the expectations of the defaulter. In a speech before the late Synod, you confess that the *aged* members did not enter into your views. By working on the worldly fears and religious romance of *younger* ministers, you may have formed a junto, who will effect the mighty object of division among your brethren. A separation, most probably, will take place, supported as you are, by the eloquence of a Dill, a Mackay, and a Magill, taught, it is to be feared, by you, to consider themselves as men "commissioned by Heaven, to weed the church of evil, and tear up by the roots, whatever may offend their privileged and infallible eyes." But when such men as Montgomery and Porter leave you, and the storm which you have excited has sunk into a calm, how do I foresee the remorse of your spirit, at having sacrificed the peace and unity of your Church, for the sake of a fleeting and hollow notoriety. The Arminians you dare not attempt to force into the fold of Calvin. The Seceders will not *receive* you with an Arminian in your roll. The high aspiring of your controversial wing can then only shiver amid disputation on unscriptural terms, and weary itself in idle and in endless flutterings on the claims of Essence or of Godhead, to compose your Trinity.

How could you, Sir, with such a passion for popularity, so far lose sight of common sense, common prudence, and that love of country which is common to all, as to aim a deadly blow at the gem of our province, the Belfast Institution? Cradled amid difficulties, struggling to emerge from a cloud which had shadowed its maturer years, how could

you at that moment, attempt to undermine its importance or throw a shade over its efficiency? Now that your evidence as Moderator before the Legislature, has lost its poison, and that your attempt to control the freedom of its charter, has been spurned by the proprietors, do you not feel that the name of Cooke, within its walls, is coupled with odium? Many advocates, even of Calvinism, are opposed to the man, who with vulture eagerness, strikes as his prey, not only religious but *literary* liberty.

Permit me, Sir, a parting word. Let me prevail upon you to return once more to the primitive calling of the pastor's office. The preaching which everlastingly terminates in the excitation of intolerant feeling—the writings which essay to bring strife into the Christian fold—the missions which resolve themselves into crusades against brethren—the harangues, whether in Synod or in Presbytery, which ever cry, as to the highland messenger of war, "speed *Malise* ho," may gratify the policy of a Spiritual Knight Errant, but must generate a loathing in the truly good.

Conciliate, I beseech you, your own flock. Many, you are aware, of your respectable members, contemplate a relinquishment of your pastoral charge. What created this rebellion against the Bulls of the infallible? A conviction, that a spirit of persecution was incompatible with the genius of the Gospel—that a spirit of inquisitorial dictation was a warfare against the unalienable rights which are sanctioned by God—that a mania for mere sectarian proselytism, seduces the shepherd from a care of the flock, for whose dearest welfare he should unceasingly watch—that spiritual pride is the offspring of monopolizing piety—and that none can be true to their *God*, who are intolerant towards *man*.

Throw off, then, the antiquated coat of mail, composed of fanaticism, or of self-deception, or of priestcraft, for it cannot be proof in this enlightened age, against the weapons of inquiry and unshackled judgment.

Break through the films which obscure your noble nature. Be what you were, tolerant but uncompromising, ardent but undictatorial, and, in the expressive language of your own quotation, I will "wear you once more in my heart of hearts."

Yours truly,

W.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

It may probably be interesting both to you and your readers, to be made acquainted with the following circumstances which have recently occurred in this town. In the course of the last month, a public discussion took place between the Rev. T. M. M'Donnel, a Catholic priest of this town, and the Rev. J. Burnett, a Protestant minister of Cork. The subject was, the Rule of Faith, as admitted among Catholics and Protestants respectively, including, on the part of the former, the assumed infallibility of the Catholic Church, and, on the part of the latter, the right of private judgment, with the consequences resulting therefrom. At the present time, when we have recently witnessed Synods of *dissenters* attempting to impose tests on their Christian brethren, and to shackle the free exercise of their understanding, it is gratifying to behold the Rev. J. Burnett, a Calvinistic minister, point to the Sacred Scriptures as his sole guide in matters of faith, and assert the right of every individual, by the free exercise of his judgment, to ascertain the meaning of the sacred volume for himself; he repeatedly and explicitly asserted, that he never could believe *that* which he could not understand; and that his faculties as a rational creature, would induce him to protest against a belief of *that* of which he had not a distinct perception, and of which he had not also evidence. In reply, the Rev. T. M. M'Donnel,

called on Mr. B. to show, on the foregoing principles, how the doctrine of the Trinity and Original Sin, were articles of his belief. Mr. B. stated, that he was not then going to lose his half-hour, by proving the doctrine of the Trinity; but he expressed his readiness, at another time and place, to do so, should he be required. In consequence of this, a number of Unitarian Christians, a few days after, met and transmitted to the Rev. Gentleman, the following letter:—

"Rev. Sir,—As Christians and Protestants, we beg leave to congratulate you, on your late exertions on behalf of the right of private judgment, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith and practice. We heard with pleasure, your avowal of the principle, "that it is impossible for man to believe any proposition of which he has not a clear and distinct idea," and it is this conviction, pervading our own minds, which has led to the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity. Whilst you regard this as a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel, we cannot but consider it as opposed alike to the dictates of right reason, and the plainest declarations of the sacred volume, and that it can only be maintained on the ruins of the principle which you have so distinctly laid down.

"You will, Sir, remember, that in your late discussion, when pressed by the Rev. T. M. M'Donnel to show how you could believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, seeing that it cannot possibly be understood, and asked how you would prove it to the Unitarian, you declared that although you were determined not to lose the half-hour then allowed you in defending that doctrine, yet you were ready to do so on another occasion. As you made this declaration to the public, we now respectfully take leave to call upon you to redeem your pledge before *that* public, and shall be happy to appoint one of our own body to meet you, to discuss this momentous and important question, convinced, as we are, that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the only living and true God, and the only proper object of religious worship; and that our faith is founded upon the most unequivocal testimony of the Scriptures, as well as approved by the noblest faculties of the mind. Waiting your reply,

I have the honour to remain, Rev. Sir,

On behalf of the meeting,

Your obedient Servant,

Birmingham, August, 11, 1827. J. W. Evans."

Mr. Burnett received the communication very politely, expressed himself friendly to the free discussion of religious opinions, convinced, as he said he was, that truth would ultimately gain by it; he admired the feelings which had actuated the Unitarians to step forward, and informed them verbally, that he should have been happy to have met them on the subject, had not the very limited stay he should make in Birmingham, being only six or seven days longer, entirely prevented him. Now it is a fact, that the Rev. Gentleman's stay was prolonged to above three times the period mentioned, without his signifying in the least his desire of complying with the request made to him. I am induced to give publicity to the above, through the medium of your excellent little work, in order to show, that, while Trinitarians, in their controversies with Catholics, are happy to avail themselves of those principles and arguments on which the Unitarian relies for the defence of his faith, yet they evidently shrink from the application of those principles and arguments against themselves. With the full persuasion of the importance of religious discussions, and the firm conviction that the cause of truth will ultimately triumph,

I remain,

Yours, respectfully,

E. W. NIAS.

Birmingham, September 12, 1827.

To the Rev. Robert Stewart, Minister of the Gospel at Broughshane, Ireland.—Letter 4.

SIR,

IN resuming the irksome task of commenting on your Discourse, I feel it almost necessary to apologize to the numerous readers of the Pioneer in England, for offering a defence of Unitarian principles, and repeating arguments and correcting mis-statements, in a manner which has little of novelty to recommend it. But I entreat them to consider, that, although these things be familiar to them as the lessons of boyhood, the case is widely different in Ireland. There these discussions are but commencing; and although numbers of the most intelligent Northern Irish Presbyterians no longer believe in the doctrine of a Three-One God, yet the mass of the people adhere, with all the tenacity of early prejudice, to that strange and unscriptural opinion.

Your Discourse, Sir, is evidently addressed to that description of persons, and contains the usual quotations from Scripture, without the least attempt to show that they are fairly interpreted, or justly applied. It is a work adapted to the popular prepossessions, without either learning, ingenuity, or good feeling to recommend it.

The second reason you assign for abandoning Unitarianism, though very obscurely worded, appears to be, that divine worship was paid to Jesus Christ, during his abode on earth.

You surely require not to be told, that the term *worship*, in Scripture, sometimes means that homage which we pay to God, and sometimes the respect which we offer to man; and that the nature of the being to whom it is presented, as well as the accompanying circumstances, must determine the sense in which the word is employed. On this principle—which cannot, I think, be objected against—if we examine the instances which you have adduced, of worship having been paid to our blessed Lord, we shall find, that the different persons who offered it, merely intended to express a reverential feeling toward him, from whom they had received, or hoped to receive, some signal benefit; and that it never appears, from the language of Jesus himself, nor from theirs, that any thing more than this was intended. The blind man, who is mentioned in John chap. ix. as having worshipped Jesus, in reply to the observations of the Pharisees, answered, "Now we know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth—if *this man* were not of God, he could do nothing." The exclamation of Thomas, "My Lord, and my God!" is merely the effect of wonder and surprise, upon receiving the evidence of his senses, as to the *resurrection* of Jesus, which he had previously questioned. This was the subject of his unbelief, and not any thing regarding the *nature* of our blessed Lord.

The words of the first Christian martyr, Stephen, when invoking the protection of Jesus, at the moment of dissolution, have no relation to divine worship. It appears from the testimony of Rammohun Roy, that the notion of superior beings receiving and conveying away the spirit, at the hour of death, to the regions of the blessed, was familiar to the Jews, in common with other Eastern nations; and, as he justly observes, "from Stephen's saying, that he saw *the Son of Man* standing on the right hand of God, we may easily perceive the notion which he had formed of Jesus Christ."

The circumstance of Jesus accepting these marks of homage, whilst some of his Apostles refused them, is adduced by you, as a proof, that he was the Supreme Being, the sole object of religious worship. Upon the very same principle, it may be argued, that the Prophet Daniel was entitled to receive divine honours, for we read in Scripture, that "the King Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face and worshipped Daniel:" and

we do not read of his having been reproved for this seeming impiety. It seems evident, that in those instances where this act of homage was refused by the Apostles, their true character was misunderstood; and the ignorant Gentiles were preparing to honour them as superior beings. The mythology of the Greeks and Romans inculcated the doctrine, that the visitations of the gods, in human forms, some of them from benevolent, and others from less amiable motives, were by no means unfrequent; and, under this impression, when they witnessed the miraculous powers of the primitive disciples, they believed that some of their divinities had descended upon earth; and felt themselves called upon to reverence them accordingly. But the case was widely different with regard to the Jewish nation. They had been taught to confine all religious worship to Jehovah, the only living and true God; and when they prostrated themselves before an earthly superior, all their habits and opinions, and the express injunctions of their holy faith, effectually guarded against the possibility of mistake. It was therefore *outward civil reverence*, which Jesus, on several occasions, received from his countrymen—a tribute which they paid out of thankfulness for the favours which he had conferred; and which he graciously condescended to receive, as a mark of grateful affection.

Again, as our Lord and Saviour appeared on this earth to enlighten us, both by precept and example, we must conclude, that he would not leave us in doubt or uncertainty on that most important point, the object of religious worship—the Being to whom the thanksgivings and prayers of feeble and dependent creatures like us, should be offered up. His words are, indeed, plain and express. "Pray to *thy Father* which is in secret, and *thy Father* which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." And in that form of prayer which he taught his disciples, and which should be a model for our imitation and guidance, he instructs us to address "*Our Father* who art in heaven." And when he himself prays, it is to the Supreme Being alone—his "Father and our Father, his God and our God." I call upon you to adduce a single passage, from the first verse of the book of Genesis, to the last of the Revelation of John, in which we are commanded to offer up our prayers to the Trinity—or to any other being, but the Almighty Former of the Universe, the *God* and *Father* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. In the progress of that moral and intellectual darkness which overspread the Christian world, the doctrine of the divine Unity became sadly corrupted, and opinions strange and incomprehensible, were imposed upon the ignorance and credulity of mankind. It was then that Jesus Christ, the Holy Messenger from on high, was exalted by superstition to an equality with God; and attributes assigned to him, which he never claimed. And as the darkness increased, the invocation of saints and martyrs was superadded to the worship of the blessed Jesus. The progress of error is usually gradual; but when once it is blended with our early associations and prejudices, it is very difficult to be removed. It is, no doubt, owing to this circumstance, that we have the following form of invocation, in the manual of devotion recommended by the Roman Catholic Church: "O Blessed Virgin, listen unto me. Mother of the Saviour of the world assist me; Mother of God, Lady of Heaven, sweetly beloved Queen, and Advocate of all human lineage, pray come, amiable and mild Lady, Lady of all Angels, Delight of the Patriarchs, Desire of the Prophets, Treasure of the Apostles, Mother of the Confessors, Ornament of Virgins, O sweet Virgin Mary, pray for me, who art heard above the company of Angels, preserve me from all evils, past, present, and to come. O Gate of Paradise, Palace of Jesus Christ, Star of the Sea, Consolation of mankind, take pity of me, O sweet and blessed Virgin Mary, daughter of God the Father, Mother of Jesus Christ, and Spouse of the Holy Ghost, Gate of Heaven, Door of the Firmament, Hope of Christians,

Fountain of Piety, Safe-guard of Peace, Glory of Virgins, honoured above all Angels, Mother of mercy, Miracle of virginity, Virgin above all virgins, Temple of the Most Holy Trinity, beautiful above all creatures, O Lady of meekness, Abyss of mildness, Comfort of the sorrowful, Consolation of the afflicted, in you the Angels do rejoice. O sweet Lady of mercy, turn your merciful eyes unto me, and hear my prayers; unto the protection of Almighty God, and your holy hands, O Refuge of sinners, I recommend my soul and body. Amen." And as an inducement to repeat this farrago of absurdity and impiety, the poor ignorant Roman Catholic is taught by his Church, that "this prayer hath many remarkable properties, as to obtain a good death to any person that devoutly says it once a day, with a good intention to the glory of God, and devotion to the blessed Virgin. And saying it devoutly for any woman in labour, it forwards, with God's blessing, a speedy and safe delivery, with many other benefits."

Now this is one of the wretched fruits of the departure of men from the great and fundamental principle of true Religion, the *Unity* of God. When the Reformation, happily for mankind, swept away a vast portion of rubbish which had been accumulating during centuries of darkness, something still remained for succeeding ages to do. And amongst other corruptions of the pure faith of Christ, I hesitate not to reckon the doctrine of a Three-One God, and such a form of prayer as the following, extracted from the Litany of the Church of England: "O God, the Father of Heaven, have mercy upon us miserable sinners. O God the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us miserable sinners. O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, have mercy upon us miserable sinners. O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons, and one God, have mercy upon us miserable sinners. By the mystery of thy holy incarnation; by thy holy nativity and circumcision; by thy baptism, fasting, and temptation, good Lord, deliver us. By thine agony and bloody sweat; by thy cross and passion; by thy precious death and burial; by thy glorious resurrection and ascension, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, good Lord, deliver us."

Now, let any man, unbiassed by prejudices, seriously reflect that these expressions are addressed to a Being, whom they profess to believe, is the Omnipotent God, who has existed from eternity, and will continue for ever to exist, incapable of change; and that he is invoked by his *incarnation, nativity, circumcision,* his *agony* and *bloody sweat,* his *death* and *burial;* and say, if any thing in the compass of human language, can be found more inconsistent, or more blasphemously absurd.

When we turn our thoughts from the precepts, to the example of the blessed Jesus, we can have no difficulty in ascertaining the proper object of all religious worship. "And he (Jesus) was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down and prayed, saying, *Father,* if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done." "He went out unto a mountain to pray, and continued all night *in prayer to God.*" "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and earth." "And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father I thank thee that thou hast heard me." And in the last hour of mortal agony, he exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

I am aware, that the answer usually given to this plain and irresistible argument, is, that Jesus, in these words, spake in his *human* capacity, and not as *God.* The doctrine of a two-fold nature, divine and human, in our Saviour, is wholly unsupported by Scripture: and the representing him as sometimes speaking in one capacity, and sometimes in another, without ever informing us of the change of persons, is wholly irreconcilable with the conduct of him in whose mouth guile was not found. In the absence of all information on such an important subject,

we could not tell, when he spake as man, or when he spake as God; and this confounding of natures and characters, so totally dissimilar, would unavoidably tend to lead us into doubt, perplexity, and error. The doctrine of Christ's praying in his *human nature* to *himself* in his *divine*—of his knowing a thing as *God*, and not knowing it as *man*—is one of those monstrous absurdities, generated in the times of gross darkness, and perpetuated by the almost resistless influence of early impressions. But this figment of Popery has no foundation whatever in the Word of God. And as, with regard to the offering up of prayer to the Trinity, I dared you to the proof of such a doctrine from Scripture; so now, I call upon you to show, from the same blessed authority, that Jesus "was both God and man in two distinct natures, and one person for ever." "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

The third reason which you assign for your re-conversion, is "the power and authority which our Lord, in the days of his flesh, exercised over both animated and inanimate nature."

This portion of your work will not require much discussion. I admit at once, that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, during his abode on earth, performed many astonishing works, "which no man could have done, unless God were with him"—and that he often appealed to these miracles as proofs that he was divinely appointed. But by reference to Scripture, we find, that very extraordinary powers were bestowed upon many other holy Prophets, and upon the Apostles of Jesus, and several of the primitive Disciples. And all that can be inferred from the supernatural authority which our Saviour exercised, is, that he was truly a messenger of the Divine Will. You attempt, indeed, to draw a distinction between the manner in which he performed these remarkable acts, and that in which they were performed by others—alleging, that he always acted in his own name and authority; and that they never did. To this I reply, that we find the Prophet Elisha, as is recorded in the 2d Book of Kings, inflicted the punishment of leprosy upon his servant, who had offended him, without invoking the power of God, or making any immediate reference to such authority. Nay, by consulting Exod. xxiii. 20, 21, it appears, that an Angel, when provoked by human disobedience, had the power of withholding forgiveness of sins. "Behold I send an Angel before thee—beware of him, and obey his voice; provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions."

But the short and unanswerable reply to all your observations on this point, is, that the blessed Jesus himself, in numerous instances, in the plainest and most unequivocal language, acknowledges that all his powers were derived from God. "I have not spoken of myself, but *the Father who sent me, he gave me commandment* what I should say and what I should speak." "*I can of mine own self do nothing:* as I hear I judge; and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father who hath sent me." And lest any misconceptions should arise in the minds of the Disciples, respecting his nature, from the extraordinary gifts with which he was endowed, he expressly says, "my Father is *greater* than I."

To all this straight-forward testimony from Jesus himself, you may perhaps use the stale argument, that on these occasions, he spake in his capacity as *man*. I have already disposed of this unscriptural doctrine; and shall merely add, that every thing which makes the least approach to *equivocation* and *double-dealing* is abhorrent to the pure nature of the Son of God.

I come now to your fourth reason for abandoning Unitarianism, *viz.* that it is unscriptural.

In illustrating this assertion, you have curiously interwoven a number of texts from the Old and New Testaments, into your discourse, without

the least attempt at showing, that, when fairly interpreted, they relate to the matter in question, and support the doctrines which you *now* advocate. In this very simple manner, detached portions of Scripture might be quoted, in defence of opinions the most wild and contradictory. I might, therefore, fairly dismiss this part of the subject, by affirming, that your quotations are irrelevant; and stake my affirmation against yours. But as there are many points on which I do not wish to take you for an example, I shall devote a little time to the explanation of the leading passages which you have selected for your purpose.

Your first quotation, is that one which has been so often pressed into the controversy, from Isaiah ix. 6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

In reference to this and some other portions of the Old Testament, it may be observed, that when a prophecy has been evidently accomplished, it must be explained with reference to the past, and not to the future. For I dismiss at once from my thoughts, that most unwarrantable assumption, that the words of Scripture have a double meaning; relating in one sense to an event that is not very distant, and ultimately to another, that is remote. This lax mode of interpreting prophecy, might fitly apply to the responses of the Heathen Oracles, which had various senses affixed to them, as a convenient mode of imposing on human credulity; but is utterly unworthy of that blessed Revelation which came from God.

There is indeed, a mode of employing the language of completed prophecy, to present and even to coming events, that is very suitable, and often highly impressive, of which we have many examples in the New Testament. On such occasions, it is used to describe circumstances of a similar nature to those that had occurred—in the same manner, as we at the present day, use expressions from various writers, and apply them to the illustration of our own views, though in their original meaning, they may have been very differently used.

By a careful examination of the portion of Isaiah, already quoted, and of the Jewish History, it will, I think, be found, that this prophecy did not relate to our Saviour, but to Hezekiah, the deliverer of Jerusalem. Ahaz, king of Judah, had been besieged in the royal city by the united forces of Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, son of Remaliah, king of Israel; and having no hopes of being able to make a successful resistance, was about to form an alliance with the king of Assyria. To dissuade him from this purpose, of which the Prophet disapproved, he assured him that his deliverance was at hand:—"That a virgin should conceive and bear a son, and call his name Immanuel (expressive of trust in God), and that, before the child should know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that he abhorred should be deprived of both her kings." This prediction was accordingly verified. At a subsequent period, the same Prophet predicted the happiness of Judah, under the approaching reign of the virtuous Hezekiah; and expressed himself in the strong figurative language which you have quoted, to give an exalted idea of their temporal deliverance, and blessedness. A reference to the Book of Kings and Chronicles, will satisfy any inquirer, that all these things were fully accomplished.

The next portion of Scripture which you have either misconceived, or misrepresented, is taken from the Book of Revelation, chap. i. 8, "I am Alpha and Omega," &c. and these words you think fit to apply to our blessed Lord. By consulting the Sacred Text, it will appear evidently, that you have given an unfaithful interpretation. John begins at verse 4th, with a declaration of the eternity of God; and in the 5th, 6th, and 7th verses, having stated, by way of parenthesis, what Jesus had done, and what he had still to accomplish, he returns to the subject with

which he had commenced, and describes the attributes of the Deity, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." How this language can suitably apply to him whose power was confessedly derived from another, "who could do nothing of himself," it is surely very difficult to understand; and I am persuaded, that prejudice alone, could prevent a man from seeing its gross inconsistency.

The next portion of Scripture adduced by you, in support of the Supreme Deity of Jesus, is Col. ii. 9. "In whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." These words are merely expressive of the extraordinary powers conferred upon our Saviour by Almighty God, to qualify him for the discharge of his important mission; and of the graces and virtues with which he was endowed. But how they can prove that three are one, and one are three, does not clearly appear.

Your last reference to Scripture, is to the 1st chap. of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1—8. This portion of Scripture is expressive of the great dignity of Christ, and of the honours to which he was exalted. "When he bringeth his first-born into the world, he saith, let all the Angels, (that is messengers of God) pay homage to him." "And of these messengers, he saith, who maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of lightning his ministers." This, I apprehend, will be found a correct translation of the original. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." The word God in Scripture, is frequently applied to created and inferior natures. "I have said, ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High." "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh"—and quotations to this effect could be multiplied. But whatever meaning we may choose to affix to the word, as it occurs in the 8th of the 1st Chap. of Hebrews, it is plain, from the very next verse, that the nature of the person spoken of, was subordinate to that of God. "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness, therefore God, *thy God*, has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above *thy fellows*."

Besides, the xlv. Psalm, which is quoted in these words, and applied as descriptive of the glory and honour of Jesus, was evidently composed in honour of King Solomon, at the time of his marriage with the daughter of Pharaoh, king of Egypt. It is entitled "a Song of Loves;" and an attentive reading of it will show the occasion on which it was written. The following are extracts: "My heart is inditing a good matter; I speak of the things which I have made touching the king; my tongue is the pen of a ready writer. Thou art fairer than the children of men; grace is poured into thy lips; therefore God hath blessed thee for ever. Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O Mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth and meekness, and righteousness; and thy right hand shall teach these terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies; the people fall under thee. Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness; therefore, God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. All thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces, whereby they have made thee glad. *King's daughters* were among thy honourable women; upon thy right hand did stand the *Queen, in gold of Ophir*. Hearken, *O daughter*, and consider, and incline thine ear; *forget also thine own people and thy Father's house, so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty;* for he is thy lord, and worship thou him. And the daughter of Tyre shall be there with a gift; *the rich among the people shall entreat thy favour*. The king's daughter is all glorious within; her clothing is of wrought gold. *She shall be brought unto the king* in raiment of needlework; *the virgins her companions that follow her*, shall be brought unto thee—with gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought; *they shall enter into the king's palace*."

Now, if the word "God" in this Psalm, which is evidently applied to Solomon, does not exalt the son of David to divine honours, I cannot see how the use of it by the Apostle, as expressive of the glory and power to which the Supreme Being had exalted his Son Jesus, can be a proof that he who was *born in Judea, lived for more than thirty years upon earth, and was at length cruelly and unjustly put to death by the Jews, was the Almighty Creator of all things, who is from everlasting, and whose days draw not nearer to an end.*

You have not thought proper to favour the public with an analysis of one solitary portion of Scripture, of all that you have interwoven in your book. Perhaps it would have been unreasonable to have expected it. When your kind Ballymena friends, pitying your wants, shall have furnished you "with a Polyglot Bible, and several critical works to explain the same," the deficiency may be supplied. The circumstance, however, by some strange association of ideas, reminds me of Father O'Regan. I knew him well. His opportunities for acquiring learning in early life, like those of many others "put into the priest's office for a morsel of bread," had been very limited; and the laborious duties of his profession, in after life, had been equally unfavourable to literary improvement. He was, in truth, a very ignorant man. But he had one quality for which I valued him, whilst living, and now respect his memory—he was *modest* and *unassuming*. It was his fortune to be neighbour to a Presbyterian Minister, who delighted in argument. The temptation to attack the Priest was irresistible. Poor O'Regan, on such occasions, offered no resistance; but with an imploring look, exclaimed, "Ah! do, pray, let me alone; you know I have not got my *larning* yet."

Yours, faithfully,

October 15, 1827. VINDEX.

A NEW monthly publication, entitled "The Christian Advocate," has been set on foot in Alnwick, by the friends who have laboured so zealously for the promotion of freedom of inquiry, in that town and neighbourhood. We rejoice to see these local works springing up. We trust the "Advocate" will be productive of good. Its price renders it available to almost every class; and it may thus excite a desire for scriptural investigation, in places where larger publications may not penetrate.

THE Rev. T. W. Horsfield, of Lewes, has been unanimously invited as Coadjutor with the Rev. Dr. Davies, at Taunton.

THE Rev. R. Cree, of Preston, has been invited to Bridport, as successor to the late Mr. Wawne.

THE Rev. J. Owen, of Tamworth, has been invited to Macclesfield.

WE presume, therefore, that the Congregations of Lewes, Preston, Atherstone, and Tamworth, as well as Gorton, will now be in want of Ministers.

WE again request our Correspondents will favour us with their Communications, previously to the 16th of each Month; and with Articles of Intelligence, previously to the 20th.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 16. DECEMBER, 1827. Vol. II.

*The Proceedings of the Synod of Ulster.**

The Father Inquisitors of the Synod of Ulster, have, by their late memorable proceedings, clearly demonstrated, that religious bigotry retains the same features, however various be the church or sect which gives it encouragement. The demon is the same, whether domineering in the gorgeous vestments of Papacy, lurking, half-concealed, in the lawn of Prelacy, or skulking in the short cloak of the Presbyterian. Demonstrating, also, that Priests and Priestcraft are far from extinct, they exhibited the goodly and edifying picture of ecclesiastical intolerance in its most disgusting colours; disclosing the hateful spirit of persecution, although imbecile and almost powerless; manifesting an intense desire to immolate their brethren on the altar of sectarian animosity, but without capacity to execute their purpose; and, therefore, alas, obliged to denounce merely, being unable to administer the merciful and salutary chastening of fire and faggot, to that *heresy* whose existence appeared so horrible!

But one redeeming feature must not be omitted. Even within the walls of that dark conclave, amidst the tumultuous conflict of passions, which only religious (as they are termed) assemblies represent in their most hateful characters, though agitated by theological virulence, yet even here, the power as well as extent of public opinion was recollected and acknowledged, and sectarian bitterness quailed at the possibility of falling beneath its condemnation. Hence only could arise the consciousness of lack of candour; hence, amidst an assumption of infallibility, not beneath the pretensions of St. Peter's chair, the misgiving, that the basis of Protestantism, the right of private judgment, was placed in jeopardy by these inquisitorial proceedings. Therefore was the easily-made

* Though written in August, we only received this Article a few days since. Though rather late, we trust that the importance of the subject and the excellence of the observations, will prove that it is still a word in season.—*Edit.*

claim to candour unblushingly advanced, although a convenient opportunity for its exercise does not appear to have been afforded; and the right of free inquiry, and of individual opinion advocated, its mischievous tendency being destroyed by the judicious introduction of a Trinitarian test!*

To claim the exercise of candour, must sound somewhat ungraciously in the ears of the Bible Christian, unlearned in sophistical quibbles, but aspiring to the possession of gospel charity and the spirit of Christ, when he finds it in unholy alliance with the domination of spiritual pride—when he perceives, that humble-minded pious men, whose sole desire is to imitate their Lord and Master, to exemplify the beauty of holiness by the equable tenor of their lives; who crave to bring the thirsty soul to the waters of life eternal, and to introduce to the benighted mortal, a saving knowledge of God and of his Christ—when he finds such men denounced for mere doctrinal differences, by their equally frail, but far more presumptuous fellow-men, as robbers, heretics, and infidels, with whom it is impossible to "hold the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace"—(*Cooke*)!—with whom all intercourse must be interdicted, inasmuch as they "should neither worship in the same temple,† nor give each other the right hand of fellowship"—(*S. Dill*)!—because they "could not look on an Arian as a brother"—(*Elder*)! Truly, he will conclude, that not only candour, but also *that* charity or love, which an Apostle testifies to be superior even to faith, and which must, therefore, be regarded as a fundamental requisite of the Christian's character, is, with reckless zeal, annihilated; and he will lament, that the ignorant but

---

* As Dr. Drummond happily expresses it, Read the Scriptures, and judge for yourself, but "read them with the spectacles of Athanasius or Calvin!" The Doctor's remark, that "if you happen to take a glance with your own eyes, &c. you are immediately stigmatised as a leper and heretic, and must be cut off from "the covenanted mercies of God, &c.!" is but too abundantly substantiated by the page of Ecclesiastical History; and another proof is added to the existing mass, by the proceedings of the Synod of Ulster, A. D. 1827.

† This reverend "preacher of the word of his divine Master," who occasionally delights in the exercise of candour, and feels "no desire to tyrannize over the minds of men, because (and we thank him for the admission) opinion should be (ay, *should be!*) free as the wind," is, it must be admitted, a very harmless polemic. Does the reverend orator mean the above to be regarded as an *apophasis*, leading his hearers to the recollection of the passage—Stand by, for I am holier than thou?

angry spirit which would willingly call down the destroying fire from heaven, should be in active existence, and manifest itself in an unholy strife, respecting speculative doctrines, during which, the essentials of Christianity—the good works, the actions, the fruits, the beautiful morality which our Saviour constantly inculcated—are neglected and forgotten.

But, if by using those faculties which his Creator has bestowed upon him, some luckless inquirer is led to embrace opinions, the bare mention of which sets on end the "sanctimonious bristles" of self-styled orthodoxy, he is, in the overflowing plenitude of spiritual pride, denounced as a heretic—if, by diligent, impartial, and, it may be, painful examination, a result is obtained, not altogether in unison with certain fallible but popular monuments of ancestral wisdom; not perfectly agreeing with the dogmas of one John Calvin, though he, heaven knows, no divinely inspired teacher; nor, with a certain Westminster Confession, worthy of equal deference—then, the Synod of Ulster also liable to err, denounces the individual as an apostate, and passes sentence of excommunication in due form! How different this from the noble boast and triumphant eulogium, delivered only twelve months preceding, by the then Moderator.

"It appears to me," says the Rev. Mr. Carlile, "to be one of the peculiar beauties of our modification of Presbyterianism, that men may hold and may express different opinions amongst us, without exposing themselves to any attempts being made to injure them in their pecuniary interests. I shall probably carry along with me but a small proportion of the Christian public, when I exult in the liberty that we enjoy, of declaring our sentiments unreservedly on all subjects, without any other apprehension than that of being convinced of error." But this is no longer true of the Presbyterians of the north of Ireland. Such liberality can no longer be tolerated by the Synod of Ulster. Alas! that the exhortations of the preceding Moderator, should be so soon forgotten; that so little apparent effect should be produced by his powerful and uncompromising advocacy of religious liberty. He affirms it to be "an untried, but a noble, and he conceives, a most scriptural experiment, to set opinion free as the wind, and to combat error, with no weapon but the word of God and prayer;" but such an experiment is too worth-

less and insignificant, to occupy the attention of the Synod. The appeal which he makes to the Assembly, in the true spirit of a freeman of Christ, on behalf of exercising moderation on points of difference, has passed away unheeded like the morning vapour. "Let us, therefore," says he, "undaunted by the censures and outcries of the many, whose reverence for use and wont sometimes overpowers their reverence for the Word of God, and who frequently mistake the errors for the wisdom of our ancestors, rather court the free expression of sentiment, than seek to suppress it. Let us, without compromising any principle, without permitting any fellow-creature to sit down unwarned of his errors, encourage every man to bring to the light what is within him." To this the Synod peremptorily answers in the negative. We will not "appeal to the contents of Scripture," but to the Westminster Confession, for a test by which to judge of sound orthodoxy! Having, therefore, a standard of faith, of greater authority than the Scriptures—receiving the doctrines of the Assembly of Divines, as superior to those of the Apostles; the former, consequently, being more efficient and better qualified teachers than the latter—the Synod and the Bible Christian cannot avoid points of difference. It has even been said, they do not worship the same God! They certainly do not both receive instruction from the same source; one, flying to Calvin and the Westminster Confession; the other, not aspiring to become wise above what is written, being content with Paul and Jesus.

Although the maledictions of the Synodical Inquisitors were directed against the Arians, the Unitarians, also, holding as a fundamental tenet, the strict supremacy and indivisibility of the Deity, are equally exposed to their thunderbolts of wrath, on account of heresy. All believers in the divine unity, are, in the opinion of thorough-paced orthodoxy, guilty of a wish to "rob the son of the eternal God, of his crown of glory"—(*Magill*)!—they are characterised as "men who join in a league to rob our Lord and Master of his crown of eternal glory; as having some sinister design to strip their Lord and Master of his eternal godship, and rob him of his everlasting crown of glory"—(*Cooke*)!

The Unitarian denies absolutely, that he degrades Jesus Christ; but he dare not acknowledge him as God the Son, because Jesus never taught his followers that he was God,

and the Apostles taught that he was a man. Although Doctors, and Fathers, and Councils, have asserted and decreed, that Jesus Christ is God, we prefer to them the superior authority of our Saviour and his Apostles. We believe in Christ as a teacher of the truth, and we are content to sit at his feet, and learn from him. He never assumed "Eternal Godship;" he never taught that he was an incarnate God; he never required the worship of his disciples as a present Deity; and we are surely justifiable, in believing him to be what he himself asserted that he was. He taught his *true* disciples to worship God even the Father; he taught them to ask of the Father in his name; and he taught, that that great Being was to himself, equally with his disciples, "my Father and your Father, my God and your God." That which he did not claim, but on the contrary disavowed, we do not attribute to him; but this is very far from degrading him. It is simply by comparing the Unitarian tenet with the scholastic subtleties, which clothed the man Christ Jesus with the attributes of Deity, to escape the fancied disgrace attendant on a crucified Messiah, which produced the cry of degradation; but compare it with the teachings of Jesus and his Apostles, and with the Gospel records, and its truth will be abundantly demonstrated.

It ought also to be recollected, that it is as easy to exalt unnecessarily, as to degrade unjustifiably. But if a character be estimated far above its proper station, and some one points out the exaggeration, and places it in a just position, will he lie open to the charge of degradation? Suppose a person were to ascribe to the king of England, the title of emperor of China, would another, because he pointed out the absurdity, and refused to acknowledge the assumption, be guilty of degrading our sovereign? We believe, then, that what Jesus has himself taught, we should, as his followers, believe; but as he never inculcated upon his hearers his co-equality with the Deity, so we receive and place unlimited confidence in the truths which he delivered as a teacher sent from God, without believing in, or "stripping him of his eternal Godship," simply because he did not assume, nor teach that he possessed it.

Receiving as a fundamental religious truth, which the Saviour corroborated and confirmed, the strict indivisibility, and perfect unity of the Almighty, we cannot embrace the doctrines of those, who, professing to believe the Divine

unity, in reality advocate a divine *union*—not one Being, but a triplicity, a whole composed of three parts! And however wishful Trinitarianism may be to claim as its tenet, the axiom that God is one, yet a belief in the existence of one undivided and indivisible Being, and one which admits that three dissimilar and discrepant parts are united to form one Being, can never be reconciled with each other.*

Believing the existence of one God in one person, revealed to him in the blessed Gospel, as the Father, the Unitarian dares not place the Son, who cannot be the Father, who asserts his inferiority, who is distinguished from the Father even by Orthodoxy itself, upon the throne of the Eternal. He dares not endow him with equality, invest him with co-eternity, clothe him with omnipotence, and adore him likewise as God. He dares not to insult the Ruler of the hosts of heaven, by worshipping him who expired in agony on the cross, as the blessed Spirit who pervades all things, alone possessing underived immortality. He cannot forget the commands delivered in thunder from Mount Sinai, when the Creator of the world revealed his holy will to his creatures, and proclaimed "Thou shalt have no other gods before ME." He cannot evade the revelation vouchsafed by the prophet Isaiah, "I am Jehovah, and there is none else, there is no God besides me." "Is there a God besides me? Yea there is no God, I know not any;" but with Paul he acknowledges, that "to us there is but *one* God, *the Father*." With this belief, he cannot adore other co-equal, co-eternal Beings; he shudders at the thought of "stripping" Him whose name is one, of that glory which he will not give to another, or by "robbing" Him of his supremacy, "degrading" the peerless Majesty of heaven into a Deity having equals and fellows. And he therefore bows the knee with the Apostle, to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; he appeals to still higher authority, and offers his undivided worship, adoration, and praise, to that glorious Being, whom the Saviour himself taught that all true worshippers must address, to God, even the Father.

---

* "A plurality means more than one. More than one, in one Godhead, are several persons, who all partake of the same divinity, and are, therefore, several distinct Gods. They are no more one God, because they are combined in one Godhead, than the judges of the *Areopagus* were one judge, because they formed one tribunal."—*Unitarianism Unassailable.*

(To be Continued.)

The History of the Church of Malabar.

THE work of which I propose to give a brief review, was published in the year 1694. It appears, that under the general name of Malabar, several distinct kingdoms or principalities are included. At the period in which our author wrote, the inhabitants were not only heathens, but extremely superstitious in the worship of pagods, "of which," says he, "there are several among them of incredible riches."* "The Serra, or gate, as the natives call it, is a ridge of mountains running two hundred leagues from north to south, the south end whereof, is inhabited by Christians, who call themselves the Christians of St. Thomas, upon the account of their having first been converted to the Christian faith, by the Apostle of that name. For upwards," he continues, "of 1300 years, they have been under the Patriarch of Babylon." The first intelligence of this ancient and remote church, was brought to Europe, about the year 1501. Shortly afterwards, they applied to Don Vasco da Gama, that he might use his influence with the king of Portugal, and induce him to take them under his protection.† Manuel de Favia "after having reckoned up the errors, as he calls them, of the Christians of St. Thomas, makes the following reflection, upon his countryman's having been so long in reducing them to the Roman Church:"—'It is a shameful thing, that this Church should continue an hundred years in the neighbourhood of the Portuguese, without being reduced to the Roman faith; and which makes it still the worse, under the eye of the Bishops of Goa; but the truth is, those merchants whom Christ whipped out of the temple, were such as these.'"

In the year 1645, the Archbishop of Goa, being, as the author of this work informs us,‡ "ashamed of their talking so much in Europe, and doing so little in India, in the matters of religion, sends one Vincent, a Franciscan Friar, of which order the Archbishop himself was, to Cranganor, to try what he could do, towards the reducing of those Christians, to the obedience of the Roman Church." Repeated efforts were subsequently made by the Jesuits, to accomplish the same object, but without success.§ "The

---

* p. 2. † p. 5, 6. ‡ p. 8. § p. 41.

Christians of St. Thomas, the more they saw their clergy persecuted, respected them the more, and grew every day more zealous for their ancient doctrines and rites." Their fortitude seems to have increased, in proportion to the intemperate zeal of the individuals who sought to bring them under papal authority. At last, they recommended him "to return to his Portuguese,* and let them alone with their religion, and if he did continue to disturb them thus, it should cost him dear." The Archbishop seems to have been the very prototype of our modern controversialists. When some of the Portuguese Ecclesiastics and Seculars, who were in his train, "were at him perpetually to give over this enterprize, and not to expose his person and dignity, as he did, to no purpose. Instead of returning any answer to their importunities, he retired all alone to his cabin, where he wrote a long letter to the Archdeacon, in which he said, that he remembered nothing that was past, and if he would but do him the favour to come and speak with him once more, he did not doubt but that he should be able to convince him of his errors, promising withal, to do great things for him, if he would but entirely submit himself to the Roman Church."

Various proposals were made to bring about an interview between the contending parties. The one party proposed, that they should wait on the Archbishop, on board his galley,† where they found him with all his priests and Jesuits, and several gentlemen expecting. His Grace commenced his controversy extremely much in the same manner as is practised by the reverend gladiators of the present day. Having cross-questioned them on the gospel of John, the Archdeacon was heard in reply. Whether, as at present, the disputants were limited to half-hour time, does not appear. "The Archbishop ran into a long discourse on the supremacy of St. Peter, and of the Pope's being his successor." At last, there was an apparent truce to hostilities, which was not, however, of long continuance. We find him shortly afterwards, bitterly complaining, that "when he elevated the Sacrament,‡ the people all shut their eyes that they might not see it, and beat one of his scholars for having named the Pope in his prayers; and when he showed them an image of our Lady, cried out, 'Away with that filthiness, we are Christians, and for that reason, do not adore idols or pagods.'"

* p. 65. † p. 68. ‡ p. 84.

At last, the Archbishop, being, like our modern code-makers, vehemently addicted to making creeds, gravely drew up the following formulary, declaring that he would never heed the Archdeacon, until he had subscribed the following articles:

"1. That he abjured all the errors of Nestorius, and of all his followers, Diodorus and Theodorus (who, says the narrator, by the way, were both in their graves before Nestorius was ever heard of), acknowledging them to be cursed heretics, that are burning in hell for their errors."

"2. That he should confess there was but one Christian Law."

"3. That he should subscribe the Confession of Faith, which he sent to him from Goa, when he made him Governor of the Bishoprick."

"4. That he should deliver all the Books of the Diocese, to be amended or burned, according as they deserved."

"5. That he should swear obedience to the Pope, as St. Peter's successor, and Christ's Vicar upon earth, and the supreme head of all Christians, and of all Bishops, Archbishops, Primates, and Patriarchs, in the world, so that none can be saved out of his obedience."

"6. That he should curse the Patriarch of Babylon, as a Nestorian, heretic, and schismatic, and swear never to obey him any more, in any matter, nor to have any farther commerce or communication with him, by letters or otherwise."

"7. That he should swear, never to receive any Bishop or Prelate in the Serra, but what should be sent thither by the Pope, and to obey whomsoever he sent."

"8. That he should swear to acknowledge and obey him for his true prelate, as being made so by the Pope."

"9. That he should pass olas, or provisions, for the Assembly or Diocesan Synod, to treat of all such matters, as the Archbishop should think fit, and swear to be present at it himself."

"10. That he should accompany the Archbishop peaceably, wheresoever he went, without any thing of guards, and should go along with him in his galley, to all the churches he had a mind to visit."

Having thus drawn up for him, this mingled mass of blessings and cursings, he seems to have suspended hostilities for a time.

In conclusion, the following is a brief summary of the doctrines of the Church of Malabar.

1. She condemns the Pope's supremacy.
2. She affirms that the Church of Rome is fallen from the true faith.
3. She denies Transubstantiation, or that Christ's body and blood, are really and substantially in the Eucharist.
4. She condemns images, and the adoration of them, as idolatrous.
5. She makes no use of oils, in the administration of Baptism.
6. She allows of no spiritual affinity.
7. She denies Purgatory.
8. She denies the necessity of auricular confession.
9. She knows nothing of extreme unction.
10. She allows her priests to marry as often as they have a mind, and ordains such as have been married three or four times, and to widows, without scruple.
11. She denies matrimony to be a Sacrament.
12. She holds but two orders, Priesthood and Diaconate.
13. She celebrates in leavened bread.
14. She consecrates with prayer.
15. She denies confirmation to be a Sacrament.

I have thus attempted to give a brief analysis and review of this very interesting work. In a subsequent essay, I shall offer some observations on the history of the Synod of Diamper, which met in the year 1599.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

Revivals of religion among Orthodox Christians, do not appear confined to time or place. In the dark ages of the world, and in those countries which were sunk in the most degrading ignorance and grossest superstition, the priest had no easier task to perform, than the imposition which he practised on the credulity of mankind. But in the nineteenth century, and in a country, too, that enjoys the greatest degree of civil and religious liberty of any upon the face of the earth, one naturally looks for a different state of things. Pious frauds and monkish superstitions, seem strangers to a land of pure freedom—whose boast is universal liberty—whose characteristics are knowledge, religion, and truth.

My mind has been bent to this subject, by reading in the Congregational Magazine (a London orthodox periodical) for Sept. and Oct. accounts of Revivals of Religion in the United States. That work, as is natural to expect, speaks of these "*refreshings from the Lord*," in terms of unmeasured commendation; and strives to stimulate the English Evangelicals to copy the glorious example of their brethren in America. A writer in this work, for October, laments the change that is taking place among the Calvinistic Dissenters in England. According to his statements, the ministers of the Establishment are approaching much nearer the popular standard of Orthodox preaching; and, that "a dissenting audience is amused with a wordy evangelical harangue." To what extent this pulpit frigidity prevails among the Calvinists of England, I am not able to ascertain. But that a greater zeal actuates their American brethren, appears pretty evident from the late religious revivals in that country. I have before me, the "Christian Examiner" (for May and June, 1827), a respectable periodical, published at Boston U. S. which contains a review of the revivals to which the Congregational Magazine has devoted many of its pages. The following are extracts from the above publication, which I send for your invaluable Miscellany, should you deem them worthy of insertion.

The revivals to which the following remarks principally relate, took place at Troy and Utica and their vicinity, in the state of New-York. The chief instruments in this pious work, were the Revs. Nathan Beman and Charles G. Finney, who, according to their own acknowledgment, and that of their coadjutors, regarded it merely as a cunning device to impose on the ignorant and inexperienced. As a proof of this, I refer to the following extract:—"Mrs. Brower sent a request to William M. Bliss, Esq. an elder of the church, to call upon her, and explain the novelty. He complied; and after she had remarked how unscriptural and unreasonable it was, he assented to the propriety of her observations; but said, that it was supported simply for the purpose of creating a revival; and, for that reason, solicited her to manifest no opposition to it."

A few specimens will show the reader the means by which this pious fraud was effected. The following is the closing sentence of one of Mr. Finney's sermons at Utica.

"You sinners at Utica, and some of you who now hear me, will go to hell, and the saints and angels will look down

from heaven, and when they see the sinners of Utica, in the lowest, deepest, darkest pit of hell, they will shout and clap their hands for joy!" Again, this same gentleman, in a sermon preached at Troy, "after describing the language of the redeemed in heaven, as being," "not unto us, but unto thy name be glory;" he said, "we should see these Restorationists come smoking and fuming out of hell to the gate of heaven; which being opened, they will say, Stand away you old saints of God, we have paid our own debt, we have a better right here than you; and you, too, Jesus Christ, stand aside, get out of our way; no thanks to you our being here; we come here on our own merits!" Again, on another occasion, the following blasphemous language was used:—"Why, sinner, I tell you, if you could climb to heaven, you would hurl God from his throne—yes, hurl God from his throne! O yes, if you could but get there, you would cut God's throat—yes, you would cut God's throat!

Mr. Beman appears to have adopted this mode of "*pungent preaching*," as they called it. "Complaints have been made of my manner of preaching, and it is said, such kind of preaching will not last long. But you need not flatter yourselves with that; for I have but just commenced. I shall go all round these pews, and shall follow you, until I bring you all upon your marrow-bones!"

It appears to have been a common practice at their "*meetings of inquiry*" and "*anxious meetings*," which were generally held in the night, and in a dark room, to mention individuals and families by name in their prayers, and call down vengeance from heaven upon those on whom they could not operate. A noted instance of this kind occurred in the town of Trenton, at the house of the Rev. Oliver Wetman, the pastor of the Presbyterian Church in that place. The Rev. Nathan Smith, whilst engaged in prayer, spoke in reference to an individual by name, whose venerable old age and truly virtuous and Christian life, had endeared him to the hearts of all that were capable of appreciating the worth of real excellence. This minister of the meek and merciful Jesus, called on God "to smite that wicked man, that hardened Pharisee, who stands on an eminence, and has embraced a lie, and is leading multitudes that entrench themselves behind him, down to hell. O God, send trouble, anguish, and affliction, into his bedchamber this night, shake his house over him, and cause him to tremble; God Almighty, shake him over hell!"

The descriptions of the "*anxious meetings*," very much correspond to some public prayer-meetings among the Wesleyan Methodists, which I recollect attending a few years ago; when a similar work to that in America was going on in that denomination. "In the 'anxious meetings,' the leader or leaders, tread softly about as they proceed, whispering to each individual some question or questions; such as, 'do you love God?'—'do you love the Lord Jesus Christ?'—'have you made your peace with God?' or some other question of this nature, with now and then an interrogation; 'don't you think this a solemn place?' 'don't you think God is here?'—'don't you feel awful?' In some of these meetings, a lad was interrogated; but being intimidated, and fearing he should not answer properly, or to satisfaction, was silent. He was forthwith named, and the saints were called upon to pray for Joseph Pride, and prayers were offered for Joseph Pride, that he might be delivered of a dumb devil!"

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

REGARDING the Christian Pioneer as a work destined to promote that manly freedom and energy of thought on all religious and moral subjects, on which the best interests of our race, both in this and the future stages of their existence most essentially depends, I am induced to offer the following remarks, the more deserving of attention, as proceeding from the pen of an "Orthodox" Missionary, for insertion in its pages. They are interesting, on account both of the liberality and the great importance of the sentiments, and as affording a just, though melancholy, description of the state to which the religious principle is degraded, under the ruthless sway of eastern despotism.

HOMO.

"The principal religious characteristic of Syria and the Holy Land, common to all professions and sects, at once the child and the parent of unvarying ignorance, is that SYSTEM OF DISTINCTION BETWEEN PRIESTHOOD AND LAITY, felt even where not avowed; according to which, it seems to be the interest of a few professed teachers to hold the rest of their fellow creatures in darkness.

"Knowledge, in reference to many subjects, is inevitably the property of a few, in comparison with the bulk of mankind; but religious knowledge is the common property of all; and the very scope of the appointment of teachers in the Christian religion, is, that all may alike become well learned in the oracles of truth—*thoroughly furnished unto all good works—truly wise unto salvation.* From this equitable line, how widely have men of every clime and every creed deviated, till priestcraft has become a term of popular reproach, from which even the purest, the most disinterested, and enlightened persons of the sacred order, cannot always find, in the public opinion, candour sufficient to acquit them!

"But see with what an oppressive influence this distinction operates in Syria! How far is the interval by which the professors of each set of dogmas distance the illiterate! Hence, the high-minded Pharisee, *the Hebrew of the Hebrews,* closing the door of knowledge to the '*accursed people.*' Hence, the Akals, and the Djahelin, initiated, and uninitiated, among the Druses. Hence, the Ulernas, with the Koran in their hand, giving them civil as well as religious prerogative over the Fellah that trembles at their nod. Hence, the Confessor, with a power little short of inquisitorial although dependent on popular opinion, a sentiment, however, so inwrought into the habits and feelings of professing Christians in these countries, that the crouching penitent no more dares to canvas this authority of a fellow man, which besets him so closely, so visibly, so tangibly, so oppressively, than he would dare to question the existence or the government of God himself. When it is considered, that, even in the most enlightened society, few rise into action higher than the ordinary level of custom; few, very few, in reality, practically deciding for themselves; that is, freely and wisely; it must be painfully evident, that in a country like Palestine, where the means of knowledge are so scanty, and the encouragements to improvement less than nothing, he must be indeed an extraordinary character, who should exert, on rational principles, his liberty to choose in religion for himself. He must have emancipated his mind from inveterate habits; he must have cast hereditary notions into the grave of his ancestors; he will be doing a kind of sacred violence to the public feeling; and he may reckon upon the certain indignation and opposition of a small but

energetic aristocracy, with whom alone has rested, hitherto, the prerogative of thinking both for themselves and others.

"It might be supposed that the existence of the sacred books among the different bodies, would furnish facilities for exploring where lie the errors of the various religious systems, and that appeal to such books, consequently, would lead, in some measure, to the discovery of truth. There is, no doubt, some weight in this consideration. An authorised book is at all times a standard for investigation. Most of the people of Palestine have such books, by them accounted sacred: such are the Pentateuch, the Hebrew Scriptures, the whole of the Old and New Testaments, the Koran, and the supposed books of the Druses. But in Syria, what is the amount of this remark, that 'truth lies in books?' How many are the copies of these books, and in whose possession do they rest? Where either copies of these books are scarce, or the art of reading not general, or the reading of these books prohibited, what can it avail to the benefit of the population at large, to be persuaded, 'that truth lies somewhere, if we knew but where?' Of books it may truly be said, that, to an uneducated country, they are, in all respects, the converse of that which they are in an enlightened nation. Where all can read, and all are free to read, books seem almost to form an integral part of the community: they affect the public mind: they supply materials of friendly conversation: they challenge trial at the bar of general opinion: they live and act, and are not forgotten, if their services have stood the test of experience, and proved beneficial to society: they travel to far-distant countries: they multiply their own species, and become an immense and influential family; as it were a world of separate, but not absent spirits; fit associates for the intellectual men who entertain and cherish their company. All this and more, might be affirmed of the wondrous art of communicating and perpetuating our ideas, by means of writing and printing. But, in an ignorant land, all this is not. The copious materials of historical fact, of logical argument, of moral or religious sentiment, which have been, from time to time, committed to paper, are negligently kept, and often consigned to oblivion! Study, in such a land as Turkey, seems like an unprofitable idleness; a library, waste of money, or a dangerous indication of superfluous wealth. On religious subjects, especially, the sacred books are

claimed as the exclusive property of the sacred order; their possession of these documents, while it diminishes the mental power of their spiritual subjects, adds a mysterious eminence to their own dignity. Well aware of that popular frailty which leads men gratuitously to admire and magnify every object that lies beyond the reach of general examination, it becomes their interest to keep fairly out of sight, the standard records of their religion: while the mass of the community, in religious matters, ever more credulous than inquiring, more prone to believe the veriest trifle, than to examine the grounds of faith, hear with complacency, that their religion is written in venerable and ancient records, known to a few. Thus it is, that almost every man in Syria has his passions, in reality, still more firmly fixed to his respective religious system, by the persuasion, that it has been settled and drawn up in a dogmatical form, ready to convince him, if sceptical, or to overwhelm him, if schismatically disposed. He, therefore, neither doubts, nor differs, nor even inquires. If he cannot quote the contents of the sacred volume, he remains attached to the abstract idea of its existence; bowing to his religious superior, as the legitimate master of his mind and conscience."—*Jowet's Christian Researches in Syria and the Holy Land.*—p. 323—327.

A Dream.

I stood upon the mossy side
Of a dark flowing stream,
I saw its waters quickly glide
'Neath the moon's glancing beam.

Few were the waves of radiant hue
On its dark rolling tide,
As cypress gemm'd with glittering dew,—
All else was dark beside.

But onward far the river strayed
To a boundless ocean;
Whose countless waves, 'neath bright skies played,
With a ceaseless motion.

Methought o'er the troubled river,
Borne on the whistling air,
Flew from an exhaustless quiver
The shafts of pale despair;

And ever and for ever—cries
Of the pierced and groaning,
From the black waters seemed to rise,
In an endless moaning.

But from the bright and sunny sea,
In one chorus blending,
Sweeter than earthly minstrelsy,
Were full strains ascending.

As I stood in wonder gazing;
From a gem-studded throne,
A Spirit in brightness blazing,
Thus spoke in silver tone:—

"Son of mortality! give ear
While heaven unfolds thy dream,—
Thou see'st life's emblem, in yon drear
And darkly rolling stream.

"The Omniscient God, whose piercing eye
Sees through futurity,
Decrees the hearts of men to try
By dread adversity.

"But yonder sea, from which arise
Those sounds of harmony,
Is the bright world beyond the skies—
Type of eternity!

"There freed from vice and fierce desires,
Mortals their hymns shall raise;
And myriad souls shall tune their lyres
To everlasting praise."

H. M. B.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures.—To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

In the course of my life, I have, at different times, read and thought much on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. I was accustomed to commit to writing the conclusions to which I came, omitting the details of argument, and neglecting to quote authorities. Some papers which I have lately read, in different periodical publications, have induced me to collect my scattered notes, and

arrange them in some regular form. If, in this state, you should consider them worthy a place in the Pioneer, they are at your service.

The Bible is an invaluable treasure. We cannot estimate it too highly. But we depreciate its real value, when we admit the authenticity of the whole or any of its parts, on mistaken or insufficient proofs. To assert that the whole of the Bible is inspired, that every word therein was dictated by the Spirit of God, and that the sacred penmen only recorded that which they were impelled to do by the Divine afflatus, gives, in my opinion, the most powerful support to Infidelity, tends to undermine the real authority of the Scriptures, and deprives them of that influence which they are well calculated to possess over the human mind. Overdoing is always undoing. Tell a man that every word of the Scriptures is inspired, he will naturally expect to find that assertion in the Sacred Writings themselves, and will look for a proof of its truth before he thinks about the doctrines contained in them: and when he finds that the Scriptures never, in any part, lay claim to such plenary inspiration—when he finds, that they, like other books, have been subject to variations in the text, to corruptions and interpolations, will he not naturally incline to disregard their authority? The faith of many has been thus unsettled, and religion altogether neglected or abandoned, because what they have been accustomed to look upon as the very foundation of religion, is altogether destitute of proof.

With respect to the great multitude of professing Christians, I fear it is no exaggeration to say, that, if the church to which they belong, or the leading members of it, had agreed together to take away one-half of the writings of the Bible, and substitute other pious works of their own, they would have found no difficulty in persuading the people to receive and acknowledge all as immediately revealed and dictated from above. Indeed, I believe it would by no means be difficult to find many in England, who regard the authority of the Common Prayer-Book, and, in Scotland, the Confession of Faith, as equal with that of the Bible, and who would think it an impiety as great to question the inspiration of the one, as of the other.

St. Paul asserts the inestimable value of the Scriptures, but not their plenary inspiration, when he says, 2 Tim.

iii. 16, Πασα γραφη θεοπνευστος και ωφελιμος προς διδασκαλιαν, προς ελεγχον, προς επανορθωσιν προς παιδειαν την εν δικαιοσυνη. Which I would translate, supplying the substantive verb εστι after θεοπνευστος, All Scripture divinely inspired is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. And is not this as correct a translation as that of the authorised version? What Scripture does the Apostle mean? Certainly such as St. Peter speaks of, 2 Pet. i. 21, "For the prophecy in old time came not by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Neither of these passages can possibly refer to any part of the New Testament. They speak only of the writings of the Old; nor do they determine which of those writings were divinely inspired. But St. Paul says, that such as were so, were able to make a man wise unto salvation, through the faith that is in Christ Jesus. The truth of many of the prophecies in the Old Testament, is confirmed by the events recorded in the New. The doctrines there delivered, are explained and brought home to the understanding more clearly by the Gospel Revelation. All the writings of the Old Testament, whether inspired or not, had indeed their use, and were written for the instruction of mankind; and the writings of the New Testament, however the question of their inspiration may be determined, contain the most simple, most pure, most perfect system of religion any where to be found in the world. It signifies but little, whether the writings themselves were dictated by divine inspiration; admit the books to be genuine, and they undoubtedly contain a faithful record of a religion which came from God himself.

The Scriptures are unquestionably the most ancient and most authentic repository of all religious knowledge. They contain the most express testimonies to the being and government of God. They speak of his holding communion with the human race. They record many revelations of his will to mankind. From them we learn what was the state of religion from the beginning of the world, with those who had the best means of instruction, whose opinions were appealed to, before those opinions were committed to writing.*

---

* Job viii. 8.

Many of the best defenders of the authority of the Scriptures, men who were not willing to take upon trust all that others had said before them, have thought that the divine inspiration of the Scriptures is not the direct object of the Christian's faith. The Church of God existed from the beginning, two thousand years before any law was written. The faith of the Gospel existed in the writers of the New Testament upon other testimony, and was generally spread and planted in the world, before any part of the New Testament was committed to writing.* We hear of no miracle to attest the divine authority of any book or writing, but only the truth of the doctrine which has been since recorded. We are never told that the terms of salvation are a belief in the divine inspiration of a certain number of books. Is it not a palpable mistake to suppose, that there was no infallible rule of faith before there were any Scriptures? Is it not erroneous to suppose, that none can be brought to a true faith by the preaching of men, even where the Scriptures are wickedly suppressed? If the sum of the Gospel be taught, and men are induced to live in the true spirit of it, is not the end of the Scriptures answered?

A man who sincerely believes that the religion taught in the Scriptures is true, but who questions the authenticity of some of the books, or of some particular passages in them, is no infidel. Luther rejected the Epistle of James, but surely Luther was a believer in Christianity. Seven of the books of the New Testament, were not admitted as canonical by the early Christians, yet surely they were believers. He who believes in the divine authority of the great doctrines which are inculcated in the Scriptures, believes enough to entitle him to the honourable appellation of a Christian. Why should another article, without authority, be forced into his creed? Can any one Bible be produced which is throughout without imperfection or omission in the copying? More than two centuries had, I believe, elapsed after the Christian era, before the Canon of Scripture was agreed upon; but during that period, the number of believers increased in a manner unexampled at any other time.

In the primitive assemblies of the Church, the Epistles of Clemens and Polycarp were commonly read; might not

---

* Acts v. 14. viii. 14.

many be led by the hearing of these, to embrace the truths and doctrines of Christianity? There may perhaps be many, who consider, how erroneously soever, that the Apocryphal writings are of divine authority, while they doubt the authenticity of some other books, or some portions of them, which are admitted into the Canon. But may not such men believe in, and guide themselves by, the genuine doctrines of revelation? I cannot see how a man is less a believer in Christianity, because he doubts the authority of any one particular text, than because he is doubtful of the sense of the same text. Nor, why any man should be compelled to yield an implicit assent to any proposition, as divine, the meaning of which he cannot understand.

It must be a gross mistake, the result of mere fanaticism, to assert, that in the style, the composition, the method of the Scriptures, there is no human imperfection, or, as I have heard it asserted, that they are so perfect, that God himself could not amend them, that the Scriptures are as divine and as much inspired as the doctrines which they contain. Or, indeed, as I once heard it said, "that any serious person may know that the Scriptures are inspired, by merely looking into them from their own innate light." How is religion lowered in the estimation of many, by the extravagant pretensions of many of its injudicious professors! How is the Scripture exposed to ridicule, by claims which it never sets up for itself, but which uninformed Christians assert in its name!

In some historical narratives which are left on record by more than one of the sacred writers, we find some minute differences in the detail of circumstances.* I conclude, then, that either one or both of these writers, was in this instance, deficiently, or erroneously informed in some particulars, though it may not affect the credit of either in the sum of the history.

I sometimes find in the New Testament, what appears to me a misapplication of texts quoted from the Old Testament: shall I be told, that to think thus, is to question the truth of Christianity? Christianity stands firmly, though the writers who have recorded it, may have misstated some minute particulars, or misunderstood some obscure prophecies. It appears probable to me, that some mistakes might have occurred in the original penning of the Scrip-

* Mat. xxvi. 69.—Luke xxii. 58.

tures, some in transcribing them, afterwards some in the printing.* These mistakes are fatal to their authenticity, if it must be believed that they were dictated in every phrase, in every expression, in every word, by the Holy Spirit; but are of no importance, if the Scriptures are to be considered as the works of pious men, who, in recording historical events which had a close connection with the ways of Divine Providence, might be, like others, liable to mistake in some particulars, or to express themselves so as to be mistaken by others, and particularly by those who made copies of their writings. In their quotations from the Old Testament, the Evangelists and the Apostles followed what is usually called the Septuagint translation, which, in many instances, does not agree with any Hebrew copy extant: both cannot be the dictation of the Holy Spirit. I may give the preference to the Hebrew text, and doubt the propriety of the Septuagint translation, think it erroneous, and, consequently, that the quotations from it are of questionable authority. I shall be told, perhaps, by some, that in doing so, I arraign the veracity of God, question the truth of the Scriptures, and raze the foundations of religion; but for all this, I must speak what I think; and I find my confidence in the religion which the Bible records, much stronger, and more firmly rooted than it would be, if the Bible asserted what some of its injudicious friends do, that it is in every word and phrase, the immediate dictation of the Holy Spirit.

In a zeal for converting (which I am very willing to allow, does certainly originate in a truly benevolent spirit), the whole Bible with all its contents, historical, doctrinal, moral, and prophetic, is proposed to the uninstructed heathen, and frequently through the medium of a hasty and incorrect translation, to be received by them as a divine law, dictated immediately by God. If any of them should consider it attentively enough, to discover in it some incongruous historical statement, some apparently unskilful composition, some deficiency of argument, or want of perspicuity, how are they to be answered?—That all these apparent defects are real beauties—that it cannot be otherwise, because the Bible contains not a sentence

---

* Compare Psalm xviii. with 2 Sam. xxii. or 2 Kings xx. 12, 13, with Isaiah xxxix. 12. and 2 Kings xvi. 2—20, with 2 Chron. xxix. 12. Compare also, Gen. xi. 12, with Luke iii. 35, 36.

which was not dictated by the Holy Spirit, to whom the sacred writers were but amanuenses, as Tertius was to Paul.* This would be found a sorry way of answering objections, and would not be very useful in bringing them to the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

With respect to the matter recorded in the Old Testament, will any one say, that all was spoken by God? Some things were said by very bad men, and yet very well said; some by very good men, and yet ill said; but, where is it asserted, that in committing these things to writing, the authors were wholly impelled by the Holy Spirit? They record what was said by others; I believe they record it correctly, and this is enough for me in endeavouring to know what is the religion of the Bible.

(To be Continued.)

To the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D. D.

SIR,

THE Sermon delivered by you in Belfast, on "The effect of man's wrath in the agitation of religious controversies," is a noble offering at the shrine of charity. It is admirably illustrative of the principles of the Reformation, the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and the right of individual judgment; and it breathes the pure and benevolent spirit of the Gospel of the Saviour. It is with sorrow, therefore, that I mark what appears to me, inconsistency mingled with its wisdom, and contradiction to principles so powerfully and beautifully sketched. In page 23, you affirm, that, in pleading "the Godhead of the Saviour," you "simply repeat a statement of Scripture as distinct and absolute as it is in the power of vocables to make it, even that *the Word was God.*" Again, in page 25, you say, "And should he but tell of Him who was made flesh, that He was in the beginning with God, and that He was God, surely on a theme so vastly above us and beyond us, it is for us to regulate our belief by the very letter of this communication; and on the basis of such an evidence as this, to honour the Son even as we honour the Father, is the soundest philosophy, as well as the soundest faith!"

Where, I would respectfully inquire, were your usual powers of discrimination, when you penned those pas-

* Rom. xvi. 22.

sages? Where slumbered your Protestant principles, when you delivered them? See you not, that by these assertions, you have furnished the Catholic with weapons against your own faith, and given to the Unbeliever reasons strong for continuing to reject Revelation? Acting upon the principle you have laid down, the Unbeliever, when he reads Genesis iii. 8, "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day:" or, the same chapter, 21, "Unto Adam also, and to his wife, did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them,"—may well exclaim, things are here attributed to the Deity, "as distinct and absolute, as it is in the power of vocables to make" them, which are a degradation to the all-pervading Spirit of nature; and surely, that can be no revelation from heaven, which teaches me, by receiving it, to degrade the Great Being who formed and blesses me. Should it be pointed out to such a man, that these assertions are not to be literally interpreted, that it was customary to attribute all that was done to the agency of God, and that reason and common sense must be exercised in the perusal of the Bible, the Unbeliever meets us with the authority of Dr. Chalmers, delaring "it is for us to regulate our belief by the very letter of the communication," and arguing thus on your own principles, what reply could you make, that he might be turned from the error of his way?

When I read Exodus vii. 1, I find the statement made "as distinct and absolute as it is in the power of vocables to make it," "And the Lord said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a God to Pharaoh; and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet." What am I to make of this passage, if I proceed as you would have me to do? I must believe in the Godhead of Moses. Especially must I do so, when I find, in addition, that the plural word *Aleim*, the favourite argument used to substantiate the doctrine of the Trinity, is the word applied to designate the Deity of Moses in this text.

In reading 1 Chronicles xxi. 1, "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel," and bearing your rule in mind, that the assertion is "as distinct and absolute as it is in the power of vocables to make it," a person might be led to believe in the popular doctrine of the mighty agency and influence of the Devil. But if the same individual turned to the parallel passage

in 2 Samuel xxiv. 1, he would perceive it recorded, "And again the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and He moved David against them to say, Go, number Israel and Judah." What is now to be done? "The power of vocables" is as potent in the one passage as in the other. If he be to keep "by the very letter of this communication," he must believe in contradiction and absurdity. If he exercise his rational faculties, he would ascertain, that the meaning of Satan is adversary, and that, as Israel had rebelled against their God, he, in this instance, was their adversary.

The Catholic, however, is the only professing Christian who fully acts upon the principle which you have laid down. He receives the declaration of Jesus, John vi. 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you," and other similar passages, in a literal sense, because his Priest has declared it to be his duty "to regulate our belief by the very letter of this communication," and because, acting up to that advice, and believing the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he simply repeats "a statement of Scripture as distinct and absolute as it is in the power of vocables to make it." And should you, Sir, wish to convert your elder brother from the monstrous delusion under which he is labouring, and explain to him the meaning of the text he relies on for the truth of his doctrine, by the exercise of those powers of intellect with which God has gifted you, and illustrate its bearing by other portions of the Divine Record, and the general tenor of Heaven's Revelation, well might he retort upon you the sentiments I have already so often quoted, and put the finishing stroke to his argument, in your own language, p. 24, "After that a sound erudition hath pronounced the integrity of this our passage, we should deem it a waste and a perversion of criticism, to suspend our belief till we had adjusted all the merits of all the controversies on other and more ambiguous passages."

Be you assured, Sir, that the glorious principles on which the Reformation was founded, and by which alone it can be justified—the sufficiency of Scripture, the right of individual judgment, and of fearless free inquiry, cannot be tampered with, or compromised with impunity. Men must either act up to them in all their religious searchings, if they wish to possess a faith against which superstition and infidelity shall not prevail, or they must ever be involved

in shuffling, evasion, and contradiction. Do you yourself, Sir, believe "the Godhead of the Saviour" in the sense in which it is probable your auditors would receive the doctrine, and which the standards of your Church call on you to maintain? Do you hold Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to be equal with his Father, "the same in substance, equal in power and glory?" If so, what is your meaning, when you harangue, page 17, on "the stable realities of that place where God sitteth on his throne, and where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God?" Can he who sits on the right hand of God, be the same God on whose right hand he sits? Can he who does not occupy the throne of glory, be the same Almighty Being who does occupy it? Surely, surely no. If these questions be answered in the negative, and if you still assert "the Godhead of the Saviour," according to the dogmas of your Church—if the Being who fills the throne be God, and he who sits on his right hand, be also God, then are there two Gods, two Infinities, then are you convicted of Polytheism. And if this be "the Godhead of the Saviour," which you plead for, wonder not that the pleader for Transubstantiation is unmoved by your arguments, for it is scarcely a whit removed from it, either in incomprehensibility or contradiction.

But if "the Godhead of the Saviour," which you would maintain, be not Supreme Deity, but official, delegated Divinity, then I maintain the doctrine as strongly and as fervently as you can do. For, if the Legislator of Israel merited the title God—if to magistrates the same appellation were given, how much higher a claim to it could he present, who was indeed the well-beloved of the Father, full of grace and truth! In thus saying, I am merely repeating the spirit of my revered Master's language, when replying to those, who, like their followers in the present times, would charge that upon him, the claim of Supreme Deity, which he never assumed,—John x. 34–38, "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works; that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him."

Honouring, as I do, your talents, I have felt myself called on to address you, on what seems to me to be the inconsistencies in your powerful appeal in behalf of Christian benevolence. Lamenting that so distinguished an advocate of Protestantism, should, by his eloquence, give currency to principles which would sanction every absurdity, and transform the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, into a tissue of contradictions, has been my motive. And if one individual should thereby be encouraged to act consistently with the requirements of God's gracious blessings,—Reason and Revelation,—it will abundantly reward

November, 1827. A Unitarian Protestant.

To the Rev. Robert Stewart, Minister of the Gospel at Broughshane, Ireland.—Letter 5.

Sir,

The task which I have imposed upon myself, is now almost finished, and I rejoice at the prospect of being soon absolved from its wearisomeness. It is indeed painful thus to dwell on the records of human weakness, and human wanderings.

You accuse the Unitarians of supineness and indifference respecting the extension of Christianity, and place in contrast, with much self-gratulation, the zeal and success of that party to which you at present belong. Here we have another proof of the absolute impossibility of avoiding offence. It is doubtless in your recollection, that on more than one public occasion, Arianism has been described, as a most insidious, widely spreading, and deadly poison; and compared, in its baleful effects, to the Upas tree, of Eastern story. The evidence of your leader, Mr. Cooke, before the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, on this subject, would lead us to suppose, that the Unitarian party were both zealous and successful. Speaking of the Belfast Academical Institution, and the General Synod of Ulster, he says, "There is at present a strong Arian party in the Synod. From the establishment of a seminary, at least partly Arian, they will acquire a great accession of power. They would finally, in my mind, become irresistible. Step after step they have advanced in the Institution, and the check of dependence on the people once removed, they would finally obtain the seat of Theology. Further, I judge from the experience of other churches. The academy of Geneva introduced one Arian after another, till at last they became Arian or Socinian altogether. The same has occurred in other places, to the debasement or ruin of evangelical truth. Do you conceive," the Commissioners inquired, "that the persons professing Arian principles, act together as a party? Yes; while the others are rather divided among themselves, or feel not the same anxiety to promote their own views. Do you mean, that they are anxious

to advance their own peculiar tenets? Yes. Do you consider that there is any considerable *esprit du corps* among those entertaining Arian principles? Yes. That they wish to disseminate their own principles? Yes; of which we had specimens in the publication and dissemination of the sermons of Dr. Price and Dr. Bruce, as well as in taking the most public occasions, such as ordinations, to advocate their own peculiarities, and impugn others." On the other hand, *you* say, that the Arians "seem either to think that their own system of religion is worthless, or they consider religion in general, useless, and the forms of it a matter of indifference!" Between such conflicting authorities, it does not become me to decide. But one thing is evident, whether the Arian zealously endeavours to promote his peculiar views of the Gospel, or submits in calmness and silence to the obloquy that is heaped upon him by his enemies, trusting to the gradual but efficacious influence of truth, he cannot hope to escape censure. In the former instance, he is denounced as a pestilent and dangerous heretic—in the latter, as the advocate of "a system that is cold and lifeless!"

Although I am far, very far, I hope, from the unchristian spirit which would condemn to future misery, those who differ from me in religious opinion, yet I by no means consider it a matter of indifference whether we are in error or not, in the formation of our creeds. There are some truths, doubtless, of more importance than others; and all errors are not equally dangerous. But there is no truth which has not a greater or less affinity to the perfection and happiness of human beings; and there is no error which does not detract something from the value of him who is subject to its influence. And among the good effects arising from an humble and conscientious inquiry after truth, is diffidence in our own judgments—forbearance to those who think differently—and a more general diffusion of kind and liberal feeling.

Some of our Ministers, from having witnessed so often the evils of religious controversy, have cautiously abstained from it; and have trusted, that, in proportion to the general diffusion of knowledge, the darkness of religious prejudices would also pass away. It was a benevolent, but not a well-founded hope. For experience has shown, that men of extensive acquirements on other subjects, have long remained in profound ignorance on this one, of such vast importance. Conceiving it either to be too sublime, or too mysterious for the human faculties to comprehend, they tamely surrender their understandings to the guidance of others, and receive their faith as an inheritance from their fathers. It appears to me, therefore, to be the bounden duty of our teachers, to come boldly forward, on every suitable occasion, and to revive that "long lost truth," *the unity of God*. Your reproaches will not, I trust, be thrown away, but excite them to renewed and more vigorous exertions.

Already has the sound gone forth throughout almost every portion of this land. Doctor Bruce, that venerable man of God, who, for almost half a century, has maintained his post in the van, unnerved by age, has come forward, with unabated ardour, in the

glorious struggle. Mr. Montgomery, who, with a chosen few that bowed not the knee to Baal, stood forth, at the late meeting of the Synod of Ulster, as the uncompromising advocate of religious freedom, has redeemed from contempt the Presbyterian character, and acquired for himself a deathless name. Even the amiable and gentle Dr. Drummond, roused from his peaceful studies, has entered the arena of polemical controversy, with powers of no ordinary kind, and covered with the panoply of reason and of truth.

But although I am very anxious that our Ministers should labour with renewed diligence and zeal, in the glorious cause of truth, I would not, by any means, recommend to them as a model, some of those "WANDERING WORTHIES" who have gone forth from the Synod of Ulster, to enlighten and reform the world. I would not wish them, in the superabundance of their zeal, to devote themselves to distant cares, whilst *more immediate and more important duties were neglected*—to be strangers at home, "going to and fro in the earth, and walking up and down in it." I would not wish them *to abandon the table of the Lord, and leave its services to be performed by men, whom they have, at other times, and in other places, affirmed to be separated from Atheism by a partition slight as the web of the gossamer, that they might be enabled, at the earliest moment, to bow in the presence of an earthly Ruler!* I would not wish them, with smooth and honeyed words, to worm themselves into the unsuspecting confidence of men whose opinions they detest, in order to procure the means and opportunities of undermining them—to partake of their kindness and hospitality, and afterwards, if occasion serve, to denounce them as enemies of the truth; like the adder in the fable, which, when awakened from its torpor, stung the hand of the benefactor that had chafed and warmed it into vitality. This is one of the pious frauds, which Presbyterian Jesuitism has devised and practised, but from which the ingenuous mind turns with contempt and loathing.

I presume we are to reckon amongst missionary labours, your journey to London, under the auspices of Mr. Cooke, who, by a wondrous misnomer, was then called the *Moderator* of the General Synod of Ulster. It is said, that, in the plenitude of his power, and in the magnificent display of ephemeral authority, he issued his high behest to several members of that reverend assembly, who, he hoped, would swell the triumph of his train. Whilst some doubted his authority, and others disobeyed, you hastened, like a duteous vassal, to follow the steps of your chieftain. Mr. Cooke, it would seem, found, to his surprise, that he had exceeded his powers, and that the Committee of Parliament declined to examine you, on the ground that your presence was unexpected, and uncalled for. Here was indeed a difficulty. The world was in danger of being deprived of the benefit of your experience; and though last, not least, you were likely to be deprived of a liberal allowance for expenses. It is said, that, on this trying occasion, all your ingenuity had to be put into requisition; and after a good deal of management, which a man not choice in his expressions, like Joseph Hume, might call *jobbing*, a summons was at last put

into your hands, as a plea to grant you travelling charges; but that the Committee, sated with the evidence of the leader, had dispensed with that of the attendant. Others, indeed, boldly affirm, that you were examined at great length, on the subject of *illicit distillation*, and that the gentlemen who questioned you, were equally astonished and delighted, with the extent of your knowledge and experience! But whether you passed through the *form* of an examination, or not, it is, I believe, very generally admitted, that your presence was not desirable; and that after some skilful manœuvring, a sum of money was obtained, that amply compensated for all the fatigue, and all the mortification you had endured. This, I suppose, is what you would call, "being instant in season, and out of season!"

Another accusation which you have preferred against Unitarians, is, that we are deficient in piety.

In attempting to vindicate ourselves from so serious an imputation, there is danger of incurring the charge of vain-glorious boasting, and of discovering a spirit very different from that lowliness of mind which is befitting human weakness, and which the Gospel commands us to cherish. Comparisons of differing sects in religious attainments, appear to me peculiarly offensive, and likely to generate that spiritual pride, which presents one of the most serious obstacles to the admittance of truth into the mind, and is an unfailing source of bigotry, and all manner of uncharitableness.

A slight acquaintance with mankind, will teach us, that they are not always to be most depended on, who make the loudest and most frequent professions of their "growth in grace;" for religion, even in the present day, I much fear, is sometimes worn as a cloak, to hide base and selfish ends—there are still to be found, those "who devour widows' houses, and for a pretence, make long prayers."

We have been commanded by our Saviour, to avoid all ostentation in prayer. "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men; verily, I say unto you, they have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father, who is in secret; and thy Father, who seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly."

Permit me also to observe, that that piety is usually the most free from the alloy of human passion, which is not of an obtrusive nature—which prompts us not to seek the public gaze, nor the voice of applauding multitudes, but rather to delight in calm and silent reflection—to retire from the noise, and the bustle, and the vanities of the world, to hold a sacred intercourse with God; a blessed communion of the spirit with the Father of spirits.

Whether Unitarians be deficient in pious feeling, as it is an affair that lies between them and their God, cannot, I think, well be ascertained by a weak and erring fellow mortal, who yet presumes to judge; but is best known to Him "who searcheth the

heart, and trieth the reins of the children of men, before whom we must one day appear." I shall not therefore, on such a subject, challenge comparison, nor imitate the conduct of the self-righteous Pharisee, who prayed, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are;" but humbled in the dust, on account of many failings and imperfections, say, with the poor Publican, "God be merciful to us sinners."

But if we be deficient in piety, as you have taken upon you to affirm, then are we indeed without excuse. For, whilst other religious systems present such gloomy and appalling views of the Divine Being, and the condition of man, as tend to repress every grateful feeling, and chill the warm emotions of the human heart, the faith which we profess, teaches us to address our prayers unto a Being, whose goodness is as extensive as his power—to a Father, who is in heaven. The former, remind us of Mount Sinai, on which there were thunderings, and lightnings, and a thick cloud; and to which the people dared not approach. The latter, presents us with the most sublime and consolatory views of God, and of his dealings with the children of men; and the native dictates of our hearts, as well as the merciful commands of a benevolent God, impel us to "go boldly to a throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to bless us in every time of need."

I have now finished my strictures on your Discourse, which nothing but a strong sense of duty could have induced me to undertake; and I gladly return to other pursuits more congenial to my feelings, which they have occasionally interrupted. The task has been to me a painful one, thus to dwell on errors which I sincerely deplore; and happy should I be, could I blot out from the page of memory, scenes and events in which you, and some whom I long esteemed and loved, have largely participated.

If, in the course of these Letters, I have at all expressed myself too warmly, I intreat those who may read them, to pardon an infirmity of temper, that has been too severely tried, in these wretched times, by weakness, indiscretion, and apostacy; and in judging of the cause for which I plead, carefully to distinguish between it, and the indiscretion of its advocate.—Farewell,

Yours, faithfully,

VINDEX.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *December* 1, 1827.

THE following extracts from "The Christian Reformer," for October, will, we are confident, gratify our readers, and cheer the labours of all friends to scriptural investigation and Christian freedom:

"The event which many of our readers must have perceived that we looked forward to, has at length occurred: the majority

of American Quakers at the late Yearly Meeting, have openly declared the Unitarian doctrine, or at least the right of holding this doctrine, and its consistency with pure Quakerism. This important step has been occasioned by the intolerance of the few who have arrogated the name of 'orthodox' Friends. Some time ago, they attempted to smuggle into the Quaker body, a Trinitarian and Calvinistic creed. English preachers, men and women, have gone over to America to recruit the languishing cause of reputed 'orthodoxy.' These, as well as native ministers, have set themselves against the venerable Elias Hicks, the celebrated Unitarian Quaker preacher; sometimes bearing their public testimony against his "unsound" doctrine in his sermons, and sometimes insinuating and circulating in the dark, false charges against his ministry and character. Public meetings for worship have, in consequence, been on many occasions scenes of great disorder. The effect is, that the Quaker body in the United States have resolved to emancipate themselves from the fetters of bigotry and intolerance, of which some have been forged for them in England. They will probably be henceforth two bodies, Liberals and Illiberals, or, as we perceive they are denominated in American publications, Tolerants and Intolerants. It requires, however, no gift of prophecy to foresee, that, in a country like America, illiberality cannot long maintain its ground; it may be strengthened for a time by *imported* prejudices, but, exposed in a free land to the broad glare of day, these wares will soon lose their credit."

"It is here proper to state, that the whole number of quarterly meetings belonging to Pennsylvania, are twelve, of which *four* may be termed, according to their own pretensions, *Orthodox;* and the other eight are decidedly what are called, by way of distinction, *Tolerants.* The sentiments of these delegates, as it respects the unhappy existing dissensions, appear to have been about fifty for advocating intolerant measures; and upwards of one hundred, who were the supporters of that Christian liberty and toleration, which are the fundamental principles of the Society."

"Thus, then, William Penn is vindicated and honoured by his disciples, in the State of his own founding. Could he look down and see what is passing, his righteous and exalted spirit would rejoice in the progress of the Truth and Liberty to which his mind, and tongue, and pen were devoted.

"We are a little curious to see how the conduct of the American Quaker Liberals, will be interpreted by their brethren in England. If there be any appeal to the English Friends on the part of the 'orthodox' minority in Pennsylvania, the whole question of Unitarianism must come into discussion. This, however, the tried prudence of English Quakers will surely prevent. At the same time, the facts of the case cannot be kept from public view. The Quakers may be the last to acknowledge them; but even they must at length admit the unwelcome truth, that, in America, Quakerism and Unitarianism have formed an alliance. May it be long-continued and honourable, and productive of all the fruits of Christian Righteousness, Truth, and Liberty."

HAPPY are we to announce, that the admirable Essay, by Dr. Drummond of Dublin, on the doctrine of the Trinity, in reference to the controversy between Mr. Pope and Mr. Maguire, and which we reviewed in our First Volume, p. 459–465, has produced so powerful an effect in Ireland, as to require a second edition. It is much enlarged, and if possible improved. We heartily recommend it to our readers. We have space only for an extract from the additional Preface:—

"As to the arguments hitherto arrayed against the chief doctrine of the Essay, they are thin and vapoury, and of no consistence. When touched by a single spark of truth, like the chymist's bubbles of gas, they explode and disappear. One Rev. Orator affirms, that the doctrine of 'three in one' must be true, because it is embraced by the majority; and for this, he merits an encomium from Mahomet, Juggernaut, and the Bonzes of China. Another expatiates on the horrible impiety of questioning it on account of its being mysterious and incomprehensible, since many things are beyond our ken; and for this, the believers in the incarnations of Bramah should honour him with a temple or Pagoda. A third, determined to swell the general clamour, took up the polemic trumpet, and *tried to sound a charge*, but, '*inceptus clamor frustatur Hiantem.*' The feeble note scarcely struggled into existence. It died away before it could be ferried across the Liffey, and only a favoured few in the vicinity of Usher's Quay, heard its expiring sigh. Another Rev. Performer, who boasts an alliance with Episcopacy, having expended some blank cartridge against the Author, at a public meeting in Belfast, got a congregation assembled in Dublin for a charitable object, and surprised them, as by a sudden volcanic eruption of smoke and ashes, with a rumbling peal of invective against Unitarianism. 'Zeal without knowledge' was gratified at the expense of charity; and in the kindling enthusiasm of the hour, his admirers saw, or thought they saw, a mitre hovering over his head. But a certain Unitarian Christian, who chanced to be present, saw the visionary appearance also, and to *his eye* it seemed by its conical shape, its tassels and its bells, to be a much more appropriate adornment. The most active and persevering of all the enemies of the great Bible truth, that God is ONE, began his operations more systematically, by '*clearing away the rubbish*' of reason and common sense, that he might have ample room for the erection of his grand theological batteries. The work was soon completed, and he continues to fire away as fast as he can prime and load. Fortunately, he seldom fires with ball, and never hits the mark. They whose intellect is in their EAR, are amazed and edified by the astounding noise; and are ready to testify, that the surest mode of expediting the march of an irrational theology, is to pioneer the way by prostrating the understanding.

"One of the Author's chief misdemeanours, is the construction of a creed, so simple and so scriptural, that all can understand it.

Would that every creed had been so constructed! then, instead of being involved in contentions and animosities, which destroy all the kind affections, the Christian world would be at rest, and the Religion of the Gospel would be producing its genuine fruits—'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men.'

"Another offence is the attempt to revive some good old doctrines, which, in this corner of the world, seem to have been almost forgotten. The Dublin 'Christian Examiner' says, that the Author 'has not even the meagre satisfaction of being original in his statements.' Most true. He lays no claim to originality or invention; and, therefore, his readers may enjoy, with him, not the meagre, but the plump, round, and full satisfaction of knowing, that the doctrines contained in these pages, are not the discoveries of a new adventurer in the field of theological inquiry. They are of much older date than those of Calvin, Athanasius, or Pope Nicholas the First. They are founded on the ROCK OF AGES, and are coeval with the Bible.

WE had hoped that, in England at least, we had seen the last of prosecutions for Unbelief. It seems our expectations were too sanguine. Another of those mischievous exhibitions, disgraceful alike to the proposers and abettors, has lately taken place. The language, for uttering which, Mr. Taylor was indicted, might well have been allowed to take its fate. It could have effect only on minds impervious to argument. The moral feeling of humanity revolts at it. The only chance of its doing injury, was to prosecute its alleged author. Mr. Taylor, although "in holy orders, or pretended holy orders," apparently knows little respecting the subjects on which he treats. Disgusted with the popular opinions of the day, and deeming them to constitute "part and parcel" of Christianity, he threw up the whole in contempt. He did this before he had read any Unitarian publications, and if the tirade pronounced by him on his trial, be a specimen of his knowledge, he has yet read them to but little purpose. Nothing which Mr. Taylor could utter, would do the thousandth part of the evil to the belief and practice of the gospel, as will his prosecution. It is in flagrant opposition to all the dictates of Revelation. It can do no good, it may, and will, we fear, be the precursor of mischief. As evil, however, is seldom unmixed, there is one benefit perhaps it may produce, it may lead people to draw a distinction between the genuine religion of the Saviour, and that which forms "part and parcel of the law of the land," and it may thus tend to draw out the conclusion more clearly, that though Revelation be founded on the Rock of Ages, it does not follow Established Churches are; the one, may need legal buttresses for its support and protection; the other, disowns, for it needs them not. We would particularly refer our readers, if they have any doubts on this matter, to the Sermons of Mr. Aspland on Blasphemy, and Mr. Fox on "the duties of Christians towards Deists." We make an extract from the last named discourse.

"There is a sensitive apprehension about many good people, which ill beseems the man of enlightened mind and steady principle. 'The Deist strikes at my religion:' Well, he is only breaking his weapon against a rock. 'He argues against the holiest doctrines of my faith:' does he? Listen to his arguments, and if they be valid, allow their force; if not, rejoice in a faith which will stand the test of reason. 'But he abuses and reviles:' then he disgraces himself and injures his cause, and do you with a better cause employ nobler weapons. 'In this he breaks the laws:' so it appears.—Ought a Christian to invoke the aid of such laws?

"What is the effect of prosecuting Deism on the individual who is thereby consigned to punishment? You make of him a hypocrite or a martyr. You confirm his worst prejudices, and make him hate Christians and Christianity. Penalty and imprisonment were never yet the means of sincere conversion. Man clings to the faith for which he suffers; his enmity rises with your inflictions. Is it a good deed thus to make the Gospel hated? Or suppose his spirit shrinks from the fiery trial. You have then made a hypocrite. No triumph that, for a good man to glory in. How does it affect his party? See, say they, how these Christians meet us; we argue, and they prosecute; we refute, and they imprison.

"Such prosecutions are a breach of the great principles of impartial justice and equal right, which are the foundation of civil society. The Christian has no more natural right to punish the Deist, than the Deist to punish the Christian. Persecuting laws, however small the number of persons in a state who are exposed to their operation, are an invasion of the social compact; at best, an usurpation of the majority over the minority, only to be vindicated on the assumption that power is right. We unite for the protection of life, liberty, and property, not for that of religious opinion.

"I would not have on record such a confession—a tacit and implied confession at least—of the weakness of Christianity, and its need of the aid of the civil power. That it is so, may be disclaimed in words; why should it be proclaimed by facts? It is a libel on the Gospel. If there be *forms* of Christianity which require that protection, let them be known for what they are, the reveries of men, and not the Word of God—the creatures of the State, and not the offspring of Heaven."

THE *opposing* Bible Societies of Glasgow held their Anniversaries, the friends of the Parent Institution, on the 6th November, and the advocates of "pure circulation," on the 15th. We notice these meetings merely for the purpose of putting on record, the great marvels with which two of the Speakers astonished and enlightened the audiences. At one, the Rev. Dr. Paterson remarked, that "when he went to the Continent, Socinianism and infidel principles prevailed, and scarcely were the *pure* doctrines of Christianity

recognised. If these principles were again to find a footing, *their* cause was lost, and lost for ever! In one of the German versions of the New Testament, he could not recognise a vestige of the divinity of our Lord! In another part of the Continent, he found 6000 copies of the New Testament filled with the doctrines of Socinianism! These 6000 copies were put into his hands, that he might see them destroyed, and he consigned these anti-christian translations to a fortress, where they remained till this day in good custody!"

At the other, the Rev. P. M'Farlan, who during the summer had been on the Continent, affirmed, that "the characters of the individuals employed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in circulating the Bible, are as far distant from Christianity as can be. He could say, generally, every fact stated by Mr. Haldane respecting these men, he found confirmed in his short tour. He knew a Pastor, an excellent man, in an academy under a Professor, who did not know there were three persons in the Godhead; or the doctrine of Atonement!"

No doubt, the information communicated by these gentlemen, sounded awfully in the ears of those to whom it was addressed! As to the dungeoned Bibles of Dr. Paterson, we quote Mr. M'Farlan's remarks:—"They," the Members of the Parent Society, "had not only adulterated the Word of God, but were guilty of the blackest dishonesty. The Doctor had got hold of a number of impure Bibles; and what did the meeting think he did with them? Why, they were locked up in a fortress! (A laugh.) He should like to know for what purpose they were consigned to a fortress! He knew, when a man was put into a fortress, it was either for the purpose of being hanged or liberated, after being confined a certain time; but why consign Bibles to a fortress? He wondered who had the key of this fortress—perhaps some of the apocryphal gentlemen, who would let them out some day!" (A laugh.)

We trust, too, that some may be led, by Mr. M'Farlan's statement, to look again into their Bibles, and as "one excellent man," even a Pastor, has not been able to find the Trinity or Atonement in his Bible, *they* may also perchance meet with the same difficulty. They will, at any rate, find, if they do not deem the Acts of the Apostles to be apocryphal, that some disciples, on being asked, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" made the reply, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost;" and that reply may lead them to wonder, too, where the doctrine of the Trinity can be found, if the Holy Ghost be not. We wish well to the circulation of the Sacred Records; we more strongly desire that people would read as well as circulate them; and above all, that they would most strive to understand their teachings.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 17. JANUARY, 1828. Vol. II.

"*The Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Diamper.*"

THIS Synod assembled in the Town of Diamper, on the 20th June, 1599. Its "Acts and Decrees" are intimately connected with the History of the Church of Malabar, or Christians of St. Thomas, of which we gave an account in our last Number. This was the seventh year of the pontificate of Clement the Eighth. The Synod being constituted in the usual manner, and having ordered its members, upon pain of excommunication, not to leave the town until the Synod was ended, without express leave from the Metropolitan, proceeded to business.* After decreeing, authoritatively, the necessity of a firm and full belief in the ——— creed; and defining the number of sacraments to be seven, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation in its strictest sense; and affirming, that, in the mass, "there is offered to God, a true and proper sacrifice of pardon, both for the quick and the dead,"† they decreed, "that the saints now reigning with Christ in heaven, are to be reverenced and invoked;" and further, that their "relics are likewise to be reverenced on earth." They recognised the authority of the Council of Trent,‡ and reprobated the heresies of Nestorius, Theodorus, and Diodorus; the Synod proceeded to anathematize the Patriarch of Babylon. Next, they required all who were members of the Church of Rome, that they should solemnly swear, "never to obey him more in any matter, nor to have any further commerce or communion with him, in things appertaining to the church."§ The Synod next proceeded to "The Doctrine of Faith," which they contrived to render as mysterious and incomprehensible as could possibly be done, by the most casuistical polemic of the present day. In the 5th chapter,‖ we are informed, that "our souls are not derived by generation, as our bodies are, but are created by God, of nothing, and by the divine ordination infused into our bodies, at the time when they are per-

* p. 102. † p. 109. ‡ p. 113. § p. 118. ‖ p. 125.

fectly formed and organized; and in the instant, in which they are infused into our bodies, they contract the guilt of original sin which we committed in Adam, and for which we were all expelled the kingdom of heaven, and deprived of God for ever." After this melancholy view, they decreed, by way of comfort and consolation, that this sin "is now pardoned by holy baptism."* Affairs having been thus brought to what Diplomatists would call the "Status ante Bellum," they next proceeded to treat of "Purgatory." This doctrine they connect as a matter of course with "the prayers and alms, and other works of piety, that are performed by the faithful that are alive, for the faithful who are dead," and "are profitable to them."† Then they proceeded to declare, "that the bodies and reliques of saints ought to be had in veneration, in being carefully kept, kissed, and adored by the faithful."‡ It is but justice to mention, however, that, in the 11th chapter, they explain the meaning of the term "adoration," as applied to images: "Not that we believe," say they, "that there is any thing of divinity or virtue in them, for which they ought to be honoured, or that we put our hope and confidence in them, as the heathens did in their idols, but because the honour which we pay to them, refers to what they represent; so that, in prostrating ourselves before their images, we adore Christ, and reverence the saints whose images they are."§

In the 12th chapter, they decreed, that "every person as soon as he is born, hath a guardian angel given him, whose business it is to excite people to what is good." Respecting this merely speculative opinion, we shall merely say, in the phraseology of our transatlantic brethren, "important if true." In the seventh decree,‖ the Synod returns to the attack upon the Christians of St. Thomas; and, in the genuine spirit of the Inquisition, and in a mood of bitterness, and with a lack of charity, worthy of the ascetic divines of modern days, describes them as being in "error, schism, and heresy." The Christians of St. Thomas simply contended, ¶ "that the churches planted by the Apostles in divers regions, had nothing of superiority of jurisdiction over one another." In the eighth decree,** they denounce, in the most unqualified manner, "the

---

* p. 125. † p. 127. ‡ p. 129. § p. 129, 130. ‖ p. 142, 143. ¶ p. 142. ** p. 144, 145.

Patriarch of Babylon," and all his adherents, describing them as "a cursed sect and schismatics." In a subsequent passage,* having waxed wroth, they pronounced a still more startling and authoritative opinion concerning them, namely, that they were "at this time burning in the torments of hell." Next follows, as might have been expected, a long list of books, which it pleased them to place in the "index expurgatorius." From the fourteenth decree, commencing at page 154, and extending to page 167, we may form some idea of the absolute and unconditional power which they exercised over the consciences of men. They erected an iron throne, and ruled their slaves with a sceptre of adamant. In the 188th and 189th pages, they decreed, respecting baptism, that, in case of "necessity," it might be administered not "only by a priest or deacon, but a layman or woman, nay, an Infidel, a Mahommedan, a Heretic, or Jew." After all this prodigality of concession, they take care to inform us in the same page, that "none can be saved without being baptized;"† a doctrine the most revolting in its nature, abhorrent to all the feelings of humanity, which disrobes the Deity of the attribute of mercy, and even of justice. In pages 191 and 192, they repeat their censures of the "Christians of St. Thomas;" and, in a fifth decree, enact, "that all children be baptized on the eighth day after they are born:" with the exception, that, if there was danger of the child "dying before that day arrived, the ceremony was to be performed immediately." The seventh decree,‡ mentions certain precautions which were to be used, when it was conjectured that the water, employed in baptism, instead of being applied to the face, had been misdirected to some other part of the body. In all such cases, there was to be a species of conditional baptism. In pages 224 and 225, it is declared, that the sacrament ought to be received fasting, "not to do so, being a most grievous sacrilege;" excepting from this rule, however, such "as are under great infirmity." In a footnote, it is well observed, that our Saviour himself was not fasting when he instituted and partook of this ordinance, nor the Apostles who joined with him in this act of communion.

We have thus given a brief sketch of the "Christians

---

* p. 147, 148. † p. 188. ‡ p. 195.

of St. Thomas," and "the Acts and Decrees of the Synod of Diamper;" and we dismiss the subject, which may perhaps be deemed tedious, greatly admiring the firmness and consistency of the one party, and marvelling much when we contemplate the absurdity and bigotry of the other.

Calvinistic Revivals in America.

(Concluded from page 121.)

THE last extract I shall make, and which rests upon the best authority, is as impudent as it is impious; and sets the whole of Revival-making in its true light.

"On the 3d October, 1826, Mrs. Weatherby was at the house of her sister-in-law, Mrs. Mosier, when Mr. Beman entered, supported by Mr. Finney, a powerful assistant in the work of fanaticism and vulgarity, which he was meditating. This scene cannot be more properly represented than in the form of a dialogue, attributing to each speaker the words actually uttered, or, at all events, retaining the precise and intended meaning. The *dramatis personæ*, are Mr. Beman, Mr. Finney, Mrs. Mosier, and Mrs. Weatherby.

Mr. Beman (to Mrs. Mosier).—Were you ever under conviction?

Mrs. Mosier.—I cannot say whether I ever have been or not. My mind has been deeply impressed with the importance of religion at different times.

Mr. B.—What is the state of your mind now?

Mrs. M.—It is not so much impressed as it has been heretofore.

Mr. B.—Men wear off their convictions by running into dissipation, and frequenting tippling-houses; and women wear off theirs, by going into gay company.

Mrs. M.—I was never fond of gay company;—I am of a domestic turn.

Mr. B.—You are worse than other women; for you can stay at home and wear off your convictions.

Mr. Finney.—Do you love God?

Mrs. M.—I think I do.

Mr. F. (*shaking his fist in her face.*)—You lie! What reason have you to think that you love God?

Mrs. M.—When I look upon the works of creation, I feel to praise and adore him.

Mr. F.—You ought to go to hell, and you must repent.

Mrs. M.—I cannot.

Mr. F. (*again putting his fist in her face.*)—You lie! you can repent and be converted immediately.

Mrs. M.—I cannot.

Mr. F. (*again putting his fist in her face.*)—You lie!

Mrs. M.—How can I get the new birth, unless God gives it to me?

Mr. F.—You ought to be damned!

Mrs. Weatherby.—Mr. Finney, you have told Mrs. Mosier that she could regenerate herself, and give herself the new birth; now if you will inform her, it will edify me.

Mr. F.—Are you a Christian, and ask such a question?

Mrs. W.—I trust I am, and would like to hear it answered.

Mr. F.—How can you love your husband?

Mrs. W.—Love is a passion I never heard described.

Mr. B.—Mrs. Weatherby, you have said you were a Christian, and dare you ask two of God's ministers such a question?

Mrs. W.—Yes, I dare ask it; and I have asked it once before, and it appears that it cannot be answered."

"Here closed this very unedifying [we should say scandalous] interview. The husband of Mrs. Weatherby, who is master of one of the North River vessels, was extremely indignant at the treatment which his wife had received, as might be expected, and determined to come to some explanation on the subject with Mr. Beman, whenever they should meet.

Two days after, he saw him in the front of his own house, when he spoke to him, and requested him to enter it with him. The invitation was accepted, and they went in, each taking a seat at the opposite side of a table, when the ensuing dialogue passed between them:—

Mr. Beman.—I suppose you want to talk on religion, for I talk on nothing else.

Mr. Weatherby.—Not on that in particular; I want to talk with you concerning the conversation you had with my wife and sister at Mosier's.

Mr. B. (*clenching his fist and shaking it within a few inches of Mr. W.'s face.*)—Captain Weatherby, you will go to hell: God will send you to hell. (This was repeated several times.)

Mr. W.—Mr. Beman, you must not say that again, for I cannot bear it.

Mr. B. (*in a louder tone of voice.*)—You will go to hell!

Mr. Weatherby's patience was now completely exhausted, and seizing Mr. Beman, he threw him upon the floor. While he was held in this attitude, he looked Mr. Weatherby in the face, and repeated his favourite expression, 'you are going to hell,' several times. Mr. Weatherby then explained to him his readiness to release him, whenever his nonsense should cease; and he finally executed his promise, without exacting the condition. Mr. Beman then arose, walked up to the looking-glass, and after taking a view of his physiognomy, again began to reiterate his old song, 'you will go to hell.' At this time, Mrs. Weatherby came into the apartment, when Mr. Weatherby again laid hold of him, in the same manner as before; Mr. Beman, when down, still uttered the same offensive declaration. Mrs. Weatherby requested her husband to relinquish his hold of Mr. Beman, which he flatly refused to do, until he should stop his maledictions. She then implored Mr. Beman to desist, for her husband would not endure it. Upon rising, although the imprudence of such obstinacy must have been very manifest to him, he again said, 'God will send you to hell.' To this, Mr. Weatherby replied, 'God may, but you cannot.' Mr. Beman then went into the hall, and from thence, to the door that leads out of the house into the street, when he said, 'If this door is not immediately opened, I will bellow murder.' Mrs. Weatherby had before said that she would open the door with all convenient speed, when Mr. Beman raised both hands, and yelled '*murder.*'"

By this time, Mr. Editor, you may probably think you have enough, and more than enough, of these outrageous proceedings. They are a scandal to religion, a disgrace to man, and an insult to God. Let the Orthodox pride themselves as long as they please, by possessing the monopoly of making Religious Revivals, and censure the Unitarians for their indifference and want of zeal; we envy them neither their happiness nor reward. May Unitarians *ever continue* indifferent to the interests of religion, if it must be propagated by *falsehood*, and supported by fraud.

U. M.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures.

(Continued from page 131.)

The historical books of the Old Testament, the books of Moses, of Joshua, &c. contain the records of many prophetical declarations, of many immediate revelations to various persons. If the books are genuine (of which I am thoroughly persuaded), the authenticity of their records follows of course; but when the prophecy had come by inspiration, when a revelation had been made, there could be no necessity for another inspiration to record them. The person to whom the prophecy or the revelation had been imparted, had only to remember what had been revealed, and to record it himself, or dictate to others. Many of the prophecies have been already verified by their subsequent fulfilment.* Part of the narrative which Moses has given of the creation of the world, must have been known by revelation, especially that part which records the transactions previous to the formation of Adam. Most probably, this was all known to the Patriarchs before the birth of Moses, and the remainder he might have received from oral tradition. Adam, Methuselah, and Shem, lived in each other's times, and might have carried down the history to the fiftieth year of Isaac, and thus the account might be continued till it came down to his own time and observation; something, however, must have been added by some other hand, respecting the death of Moses. But having thus gained a knowledge of the facts, he did not stand in need of inspiration to record them. He was inspired when he prophesied, or when he dictated the Jewish law; but does it follow, that he must be again inspired when he committed them to writing? He might be *incited* to record his knowledge; the same may be said now, of the authors of many valuable and useful works. But, as it is not said in any part of the Pentateuch, that the whole and every part of it was dictated by God, written by immediate inspiration, or that nothing which it contains could otherwise have been known, I do not see why we should be called upon to believe it on any inferior authority.

The Jews of old, called the Law and the Prophets *the Scriptures*, by way of eminence; and preferred them to

* Gen. xv. 4; xviii. 17; xxii. 16; xlix. 10, &c.

their other holy writings. They made a distinction between "the lively Oracles of God," written by the finger of God himself, or by his immediate direction,* (which were kept in the ark, or laid up in the side of it†) and other useful books, either historical or of moral instruction. They never questioned the truth or the value of these latter writings; but they did not consider them as having any claim to inspiration.

What are the books of Ruth, Kings, Chronicles, Esther, &c. but merely human records, collected out of larger histories, which have since been utterly lost, and these abbreviations only preserved?‡

With respect to other books, Job is a rich treasure of divine knowledge, and highly venerable for its antiquity. It is wholly poetic. Job and his friends are not described as of the Jewish Church, as descendants of Abraham by Sarah. They were Arabians; and from what is recorded of them, we may perceive what sense of religion was disseminated in the world before the written law. Who was the author of this book, is still a matter of uncertainty; but whoever he was, he does not, in any part, lay claim to divine inspiration: nor does he express himself as if he were promulgating any divine intructions, except that the principles of moral equity, and of acquiescence in the will of God, which are illustrated, are equally obligatory on all mankind. In the disputes which are recorded between Job and his friends, some things were said on each side that were not just.§ Each by turns mistook the subject, and wrongly applied to Job, what was in itself abstractedly considered, just and true. This is inconsistent with inspiration.

The writings of Solomon contain many excellent moral instructions. The book of Canticles is indeed obscure; it is a dramatic poem; and it is said, that it represents, in a poetical manner, the communion between God and the Jewish Church, often referred to in other parts of the Scriptures, as his espoused people. But I think this is by no means clear, certainly not obvious to any reader of plain common sense: nor can there be found throughout the book, any intimation of its referring to the promised

---

* Exodus xvii. 14; xxxiv. 1, 27; Deut. xxxi. 19; Psalms cii. 18; Isaiah viii. 1; Jer. iii. 2; Hab. ii. 2. † Deut. x. 2; iii. 26. ‡ 1 Sam. x. 35; 1 Chron. xxix. 39, 50; Josh. x. 13. § Job xxxviii. 2; xlii. 7.

Messiah, or of its having any allegorical or prophetical meaning. How does it appear that this book is inspired? The book of Proverbs is highly valuable. It is a collection of precepts—the truth and usefulness of which, are indubitable and incontrovertible. It appears that they were selected out of many more, which were selected by Solomon,* part of them transcribed by Hezekiah's secretaries.† In the book of Ecclesiastes, there are some questionable passages; but, on the whole, it contains many highly valuable and useful instructions with respect to the vanity of all sublunary things, but it never puts in any claim to immediate inspiration; on the contrary, the author himself asserts, that the composition was the result of his own diligence and religious observation.—Chap. xii. verse 9, 10.

The books of Ecclesiasticus, and the Wisdom of Solomon, are generally regarded as Apocryphal. The authors are not known; but whoever they were, the books themselves contain instruction not inferior to what we find in other books, acknowledged as canonical. The books of the Maccabees contain much valuable historical information; and, unquestionably, a great deal that is contained in the other books generally called Apocryphal, may well be considered as the Word of God, if by that expression we understand divine truth. But I cannot, by the utmost stretch of credulity, bring myself to believe, or even to suppose, that the eternal salvation of any one is endangered, because he cannot, by the perusal of any book, distinguish intuitively between what is Apocryphal and what is canonical; or, because he cannot believe that every book, chapter, and verse, in the Bible is of immediate inspiration—that all has the signature of God himself, as a divine written law, indited by the immediate afflation of the Holy Spirit.

Who was it that arranged the books of the Old Testament in their present order? At one time, it appears, that only one copy of the book of the law was to be found.‡ Who was it that put the Psalms together, composed by different pious persons? Who was it that added the sayings of Agur to those of Solomon?§ or those of Lemuel, part of which, it appears, was the Catechism taught him

---

* 1 Kings iv. 32, 34. † Prov. xxv. 1. ‡ 2 Kings xxii. 8, 11. § Prov. xxx.

by his mother?* Who was it that compiled, into one book, the several books of the Prophets, uttered at various times, considerably distant from each other? And who put all the books together which are now called the Scriptures? Was this done by divine Inspiration? These books, how different soever in time, nature, and circumstances, were all wisely preserved by the Jews, and all together acknowledged as the standard of the true religion, as the only records of the Revelation of the Will of God. They were appealed to by our Saviour and his Apostles, in all their addresses to the Jews. Appeal was also sometimes made to other writings, when they expressed any truth.† These appeals were chiefly made to the Prophets, for the proof that Jesus was the Messiah, the Christ foretold and promised; but, in thus confining their appeals, they did not condemn the other parts of the Sacred Writings as false, corrupted, or unsound: all may not be alike prophetic, yet all may be instructive and useful in their kind. They are all, taken together, a faithful record of those circumstances in which God has held any communication with mankind—of all those intimations of his will, which, at any time, he may have made, in an extraordinary manner, to any individual.

The hopes and experience of the truly pious,‡ are things that may well be recorded for the instruction of others, though nothing of Inspiration may appear, no immediate direction from God to record them any more than in any pious writings of the present day, in which we certainly abound much more than they did. There is a marked difference between the feelings and hopes of the best of men respecting a future state, resting on the deductions of reason only, and those of men who have been blessed with a divine Revelation on the subject. Much comfort may be derived from the experience and hopes of good men—much instruction from their sense of duty—but all that is recorded of this sort, in the Old Testament, never amounts to a *promise* of future life. For a Revelation of the Will of God respecting futurity, we must look farther; nothing is there taught on the subject as a doctrine of Revelation.

(To be Continued.)

---

* Prov. xxxi. 1, &c. † Acts xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xv. 33; Titus i. 12.
‡ Psalms lxvi. 16, 19; 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8, &c.

The Proceedings of the Synod of Ulster.

(Concluded from page 114.)

THE Unitarian is charged with degrading Christ, and teaching that he is a *mere* man. Believing him to be in person a human being, on the testimony of Scripture—receiving him as one like unto Moses,* whom that servant of God, as well as the Prophets, spoke of as Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph†—we, on the same testimony, believe him to be the well-beloved Son of God,‡ his Anointed,§ the appointed Mediator,‖ Saviour,¶ and Judge of the world.** How this is to be reconciled with his being a *mere* man, we must leave to our adversaries to elucidate; denying the calumnious accusation, we feel not the difficulty, and therefore are indifferent as to the result. Our heresy is in perfect agreement with popular Orthodoxy,†† as to the human nature of Jesus; this is common ground; but when Orthodoxy presses us to believe in a mysterious union of divine nature therewith, we pause, refusing to leave the doctrines of Scripture, for Platonic philosophy and the reveries of the Alexandrian school. Revelation being vouchsafed to man, we feel no desire to become wise above what is written; we are content with that Gospel, which, emanating from a Deity who is the perfection of reason, cannot, therefore, outrage the dictates of common sense; and we prefer to mould our belief, and regulate our lives, by its precepts, rather than by those perplexing, contradictory, and fallible dogmas, the offspring of the learning of this world. We "look unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith; who, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God."‡‡ We believe him to be "the way, and the truth, and the life,"§§ through whom only is access to the Father;§§ and we place our humble dependence for salvation, on the holy promises of God, through him, by endeavouring, in obedience to his instructions, to keep his commandments,‖‖ and thus to manifest our love¶¶ for that

* Acts iii. 22, and Deut. xviii. 15. † John i. 45. ‡ Mark i. 11, and 2 Peter i. 17. § Acts x. 38. ‖ 1 Tim. ii. 5. ¶ Acts v. 31. ** Acts x. 42; xvii. 31. †† "If the ecclesiastics had not created a virtue called Orthodoxy, the world would never have heard of a crime called heresy."—*R. Robinson.* ‡‡ Heb. xii. 2. §§ John xiv. 6. ‖‖ John xv. 10–14 ¶¶ John xiv. 23, 24.

Saviour, who sealed the truth of his mission by the blood of the crucifixion. We believe him to be the "mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,"* who was "approved of God by the miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him;"† "that son of man whom God the Father hath sealed."‡

We believe that "God hath made the crucified Jesus both Lord and Christ,"§ and "anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power,"‖ and "hath exalted him with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins;"¶ who, because he "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, therefore hath God highly exalted, and given him a name, which is above every name; that, in the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."** And we believe that the highly exalted Jesus, "the son of man, shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works;"†† for although "the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do; yet what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son; for as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man."‡‡ For God has "appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."§§ And we further believe, that, through the man Christ Jesus, is salvation offered unto men: "the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."‖‖ "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ,"¶¶ who, "being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him," Heb. v. 9, and ii. 10.

The charge, therefore, is false, that Unitarians "degrade Christ," or "rob him of his crown of everlasting glory."

---

* 1 Tim. ii. 5. † Acts ii. 22. ‡ John vi. 27. § Acts ii. 36. ‖ Acts x. 38. ¶ Acts v. 31. ** Phil. ii. 8–11. †† Mat. xvi. 27. ‡‡ John v. 19, 22, 26, 27. §§ Acts xvii. 31. ‖‖ Rom. v. 15. ¶¶ 1 Thes. v. 9.

He is our Mediator and Saviour; we implicitly rely on his teachings as a messenger sent from God, full of grace and truth; we dare not doubt God's holy promises, or presume to deny the power of the Almighty to ordain the salvation of man, although he decrees its accomplishment by the instrumentality of a human being. Our Saviour, of the seed of David,* is the beloved Son of God,† is anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power,‡ is made both Lord and Christ,§ is highly exalted, to the glory of his God and Father,‖ and is constituted the future Judge of an assembled world;¶ we therefore embrace, and rejoice in believing the glorious truth to which the Apostles bore testimony, "that the Father *sent* the Son to be the Saviour of the world.**

Another equally groundless accusation is, that Unitarians deny Christ! It is hoped that the candid reader, after perusing the preceding remarks, will perceive that it needs not a serious refutation. If we cannot believe that he is the Most High God, we joyfully receive him as the "Mediator of the New Covenant,"†† which God has vouchsafed to a guilty world. Here we deposit our care, here we cast our burden, here we place our reliance, rejoicing that we are not utterly consumed, because of our iniquities—that we are allowed to participate in the promises of the gospel,‡‡ in the tender mercies of the ever-living God, and the exceeding riches of his grace, manifested through Jesus Christ,§§ who is "able to save them to the uttermost, who come unto God by him."‖‖ We rejoice with joy unspeakable, that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life; for God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."¶¶ We pour out our souls in thanksgivings to our heavenly Father, for the immensity of goodness and mercy, with which he blessed mankind, in his last best gift, Jesus Christ the righteous; we praise him for the richness of his unbounded grace, in providing for us a Mediator—the man Christ Jesus; we reverence him, when

---

* Acts xiii. 23. † 2 Peter i. 17. ‡ Acts x. 38. § Acts ii. 36.
‖ Phil. ii. 11. ¶ Rom. ii. 16; Acts x. 42. ** 1 John iv. 14.
†† Heb. xii. 24. ‡‡ Eph. iii. 6. §§ Gal. ii. 4, 5, 6, 7.
‖‖ Heb. vii. 25. ¶¶ John iii. 16, 17.

we reflect, that our Mediator is a man like ourselves;* was tempted as we are;† was subject to the infirmities of the flesh;‡ and is, therefore, admirably fitted to mediate and intercede for us.§ He is acquainted with our frailty, being one of the human race;‖ he knows what is the constitution of man, and understands his feelings, and propensities, and powers, because he is himself a man;¶ being one of us, he understands the inclinations of humanity; he is not a stranger, and an alien; he feels our situation; he enters into the circumstances by which we are influenced; he appreciates exactly our strength and our weakness, because he is a brother—bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh.** Is the Mediator of the New Covenant an incarnate God? or an infinite divine essence, clothed in a human form? Such a doctrine destroys the confidence, and blights the hope, and undermines the faith of the Christian, who, reposing on the testimony of Scripture, places his rejoicing on the corner-stone of a man-Mediator.

God cannot be tried; what earthly temptation can change the purposes of Omniscience?†† He cannot suffer any of the ills which flesh is heir to, for one attribute of the Almighty is impassibility.‡‡ The Ruler of heaven, and the heaven of heavens, is not liable to sin, for he is impeccable.§§ Jehovah of hosts cannot be the prey of anxiety, and fear, and doubt, which is the lot of finite mortality, for he is Omnipotent:‖‖ in short, the temptations of man cannot operate upon God;¶¶ the distresses of the creature cannot be suffered by the Creator, Psalms l. 12, 15; Isaiah xl. Hence the necessity that Jesus should be (even in his mediatorial office), in nature—a man. Yes! the Mediator of the New Testament is "a man, in all respects, like his brethren," Heb. ii. 17, tempted as they are, yet without sin, Heb. iv. 15; made perfect by suffering, Heb. ii. 10; despising the shame for the glory that was set before him, Heb. xii. 2; yielding up his life with assured faith in the promises of God, that he should receive it again, John x. 17, 18; and giving to all, an example of sinless purity, and unfainting obedience to the will

---

* Heb. ii. 17. † Heb. iv. 15. ‡ Heb. v. 7. § Rom. viii. 34.
‖ Acts ii. 22. ¶ John viii. 40. ** Mark iii. 31, 35; Heb. iv. 15.
†† Malachi iii. 6. ‡‡ Isaiah lv. 8, 9. §§ Hab. i. 13.
‖‖ Psalms xviii. 30; and Ezek. xviii. 29. ¶¶ James i. 13.

of God, Mat. xxvi. 39, 42; John xviii. 11. "Not as some regard him—a divinity, or a super-angelic nature, superior to suffering, superior to temptation, incapable of sin; whose sinlessness, therefore, had no merit, whose devotion had no heroism, whose virtue had no sacrifice, whose resurrection is in itself no demonstration that man will be raised from the grave; whose life and martyrdom, whose actions and sufferings, are too divine for imitation, too supernatural for example—can awaken no admiration, can excite no sympathy." The Scriptural Mediator is "*the man* Christ Jesus," yet there is language generally used, and there are creeds embraced, which are diametrically opposed to the inspired writers. The Gospel historians knew not the Mediator as the "Eternal Son of God,"† or "God the Son," the second person of the blessed and glorious Trinity—the infinite vicarious sacrifice offered to appease the vengeance of God the Father; but Christ's glories, his rewards, his exaltation, his high office, and towering dignity, are conferred upon him as a man! Who brought life and immortality to light, and became the first fruits of them that slept? The Apostle testifies, "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrec-

† Mr. Cooke somewhat resembles a disciple of Emmanuel Swedenborg, inasmuch as he worships the "eternal Son of God," as the "everlasting Father," a dogma which Trinitarians, generally, are rather chary of openly avowing. His favourite apophthegm, "the eternal Son," is not viewed so complacently by a certainly more liberal and probably not *less* learned champion of Orthodoxy than himself—Dr. Adam Clarke. It would, perchance, be profitable to the religious inquirer, too, if the Doctor's reasonings were rebutted by the Synodical sage. "If Christ be the Son of God, as to his *divine nature*, then he cannot be *eternal;* for *Son* implies a *Father*, and Father implies in reference to *Son*, *preceding* in *time*, if not in *nature* too. Father and Son imply the idea of generation; and generation implies a time in which it was effected, and *time* also *antecedent* to such generation. If Christ be the Son of God, as to his *divine* nature, then the Father is of necessity *prior*, consequently, *superior* to him. Again, if this *divine nature* were begotton of the Father, then it must be in *time;* i. e. there was a period in which it *did not* exist; and a period when it began to exist. This destroys the eternity of our blessed Lord, and robs him, at once, of his Godhead. To say that he was *begotten* from all eternity, is, in my opinion, absurd; and the phrase, *eternal Son*, is a positive contradiction. *Eternity* is that which has had *no beginning*, nor stands in reference to *time*. *Son* supposes time, generation, and father; and time also, antecedent to such generation. Therefore, the conjunction of these two terms, *Son* and *eternity*, is absolutely impossible, as they imply essentially different and *opposite* ideas."—*Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary on the New Testament:*—Note on Luke i. 35.

tion from the dead;" "but now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept."*

Who is our Lord and Saviour? It is "Jesus Christ, a man approved of God, who was, by wicked hands, crucified and slain, whom God hath raised up, and exalted with his right hand, and hath made that same crucified Jesus, both Lord and Christ."†

He is a Mediator, according to the Apostle Paul, "who, in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, unto him that was able to save him from death, was heard in that he feared."‡ "In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people: for in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted."§ And again, "we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."‖ And hence, we joyfully accept the invitation of the Apostle: "Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."¶

But it is objected, that if our Mediator be not God, he is not Almighty to save; nor, in such case, can salvation be obtained, by those who put their trust in him. But the Mediator of the New Covenant is supported by the arm of Omnipotence;** and God will use those means he, in wisdom, thinks fit to employ, for the completion of his purpose. Jesus proclaimed his mission,†† and performed his works,‡‡ and avowed himself supported and endowed with power, by that heavenly Father,§§ in whose name he was sent to bless the world.‖‖ He ascribed all things to the power of God.¶¶ And is Jehovah's arm shortened that he cannot save? Is he shorn of his Omnipotence, and unable to effect his purposes? Or do we, indeed, lean on a broken reed, because we believe in "him, of whom Moses in the law, and the Prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph?" John i. 45; be-

---

* 1 Cor. xv. 21, 20; 2 Tim. i. 10. † Acts ii. 22, 23, 24, 33, 36. ‡ Heb. v. 7. § Heb. ii. 17, 18. ‖ Heb. iv. 15. ¶ Heb. iv. 16. ** John x. 36, xiii. 3. †† John vi. 57, vii. 16. ‡‡ John ix. 4, x. 25, 32, 37, xiv. 10. §§ John v. 19–30, xvii. 7. ‖‖ John viii. 26–29, v. 37. ¶¶ Mat. xxviii. 18; John xii. 49, 50, xvii. 2, 4.

cause we are determined, with the Apostle, to know "Jesus Christ and him crucified;"* thus "building upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone?"† Is it not rather a tower of strength, founded on a rock which shall remain unmoved, when the heavens shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat?‡ It is founded on the word of an immutable Being, and will therefore stand for ever.§

The Christian Unitarian professes to search the Scriptures, not only as a right, but as a duty. In the pursuit of religious truth, he cares not for proxy-believers, creed-mongers, or the learned fabricators of old wives' fables,‖ whatever be the authority with which the world chooses to invest them.¶—Jesus we know, and Paul we know, but who are ye? He resolves to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made him free,** and he will neither truckle beneath the intolerance of Synods, or quail at the anathemas of bigotry; he will not yield to the mandates of popular error, nor submit to the current misrepresentations of the world. He appeals to the law and to the testimony,†† instead of doctors and fathers; he rejects decrees and confessions, for that Gospel which is the power of God unto salvation;‡‡ and he refuses to be shackled with systems, and creeds, and points, because he cannot forget the apostolic admonition,§§ "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ!"

D. S.

A Summary View of the State of the Argument, on the Historical Evidences of Christianity, between Mr. Beard and his opponents Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor.

(Continued from page 84.)

Mr. C.—We have no account of Christianity within the period that Jerusalem existed as a city, with its temple.

---

* 1 Cor. ii. 2. † Eph. ii. 20. ‡ 2 Peter iii. 12. § Isaiah lv. 10, 11; also, Mat. xxiv. 35, comp. John xvii. 8, xii. 44, 47–50, and xiv. 10. ‖ 1 Tim. iv. 15, vi. 3–5; Titus i. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5, 13. ¶ 1 Cor. i. 17–21, 27, 29, iii. 18, 19. ** Gal. v. 1. †† Isaiah viii. 20. ‡‡ Romans i. 16. §§ Coloss. ii. 8.

Mr. B.—Here again you are in error. An abundance of *Christian* testimony negatives your assertion. But we have more. Though it is by no means certain that Josephus does not mention Jesus Christ, yet he mentions John the Baptist; and he is assuredly connected with Christianity. And you are obliged to acknowledge that the clear distinct testimony of Tacitus is difficult. "They (the Christians) had their denomination from Christus, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was put to death as a criminal, by the Procurator Pontius Pilate." Now the silence of one historian can never negative the positive testimony of another. It may be a *fault* to *conceal* a fact, but it is a crime to narrate a falsehood. There is, too, so wonderful an agreement between the predictions of our Saviour, and their fulfilment as recorded by Josephus, in his Jewish Wars, that, coming from an enemy of Christianity, would, one might imagine, constrain the belief of all to whom the evidence was proposed.—(L. i. p. 12, 13.

Mr. C.—Tacitus could not have accurate knowledge of this affair, because public records were then very scarce.

Mr. B.—What need had he of records of facts that had so recently taken place, as the destruction of Rome by Nero, and his accusing the Christians of the crime, to liberate himself from the charge? But that records were not *very* rare, is clear, from these words of Gibbon: "At the distance of sixty years, it was the duty of the annalist to adopt the *narratives of contemporaries.*" That they were abundant, you may learn from Adam's Antiquities of the Romans, p. 17, "Julius Cæsar appointed that what was done in the city, *Diurna Acta* (the Daily Transactions) should be published. An account of their proceedings was always made out, and under the succeeding Emperors, we *find some Senator chosen for this purpose.*" (L. i. p. 14, 15.)

Mr. C.—Tacitus might have identified the Christians with the Galileans who were persecuted by Nero.

Mr. B.—For your confutation, read the words of your own Gibbon: "Under the appellation of Galileans, two distinctions of men were confounded; the disciples who had embraced the faith of Jesus of Nazareth, and the zealots who had followed the standard of Judas the *Gaulonite.* The followers of Judas were soon *buried* under the ruins of Jerusalem, whilst those of Jesus, known by

the more celebrated name of Christians, *diffused themselves over the Roman empire.*" The real Galileans, then, the followers of Judas, did not exist to be persecuted. But Suetonius, contemporary with Tacitus, whom Gibbon characterizes by the epithets "*accurate* and *diligent*," affirms that they were *Christians*, who suffered from the malignity of Nero. In his life of Nero (A. D. 68), Suetonius says, "The CHRISTIANS *were* punished; a sort of men of a new and magical superstition." If this evidence, the circumstances of the case, the impossibility of your supposition, the testimony of two most credible historians, does not satisfy every rational man, I know not how we are to attain certainty. What evidence do you require, Sir? If we had the direct testimony of Josephus, this would not satisfy the man who is not content with that of Tacitus and Suetonius.—(L. i. p. 15–17.)

Mr. C.—But I do not impeach the veracity of Tacitus.

Mr. B.—Excuse me, Sir; you do impeach it; not intentionally, but still not the less really. That man is a false man, who makes a positive assertion on what he knows to be bad ground, equally with him who does so on no ground at all. And the historian who will give an equal semblance of certainty to his style, both where he himself is certain, and where not, cannot be deemed a veracious historian.—(L. ii. p. 47.)

Mr. C.—I do not wish to shelter myself under the imputation, that the passage from Tacitus is an interpolation.

Mr. B.—I find from this, that you have very suddenly changed your mind. For, in No. 1. of the same volume, you adduce Mr. Taylor's conjecture of an interpolation among other very "applicable authorities."—(L. ii. p. 49.)

Mr. C.—Tacitus might confound the Jewish Galileans with the Christians.

Mr. B.—Possibilities can never weigh against facts; the Galileans had perished. Grant that the name remained. What then? There could only be a confusion of names, not of persons. The question to be decided is, could Tacitus have believed that the Galileans existed, when and where they existed not? Put a parallel case. There is a sect denominated *A:* they perish. Another sect is also denominated *A* and *B*. A writer characterizes these last as *B*; how could the two sects be confounded in his mind? What proof—nay, what probability from these data?—(L. ii. p. 48.)

Mr. C.—But I assert that Tacitus had no public and authentic documents.

Mr. B.—It is time we left off these unsupported assertions, and substituted proofs in their stead. Call to mind, that I proved that public registers were kept of the every-day transactions in the city; and if needs be, I can corroborate my proofs. But it will be time enough when they are impugned, or met by something more than mere assertion. Till then, I say, and I have the vantage ground, "We have, in Tacitus, an account of Christianity within the period that Jerusalem existed as a city, with its temple."—(L. ii. p. 49.)

Mr. C.—Tacitus, Suetonius, and Celsus, might have taken the story of the life of Jesus Christ as far as it was probable.

Mr. B.—O yes; they might have done many things; but *did* they do what you affirm? "As far as was probable!" How far was that, Mr. Carlile? How far was it probable? Your answer, if in consistency with your avowed sentiments, must be "not at all." What! the story of his life probable! The life of a "wonder-worker," a pretender to "impossibilities"—his death probable—who never lived! This is not probable assuredly. If so, you stand self-confuted.—(L. ii. p. 47.)

Mr. C.—No Christian writer, until we come to Eusebius, in the fourth century, has narrated the destruction of the temple; therefore, old Jerusalem was to the first Christians merely a spiritual city.

Mr. B.—Now, the acknowledgment of the books of the New Testament, by a long series of writers, from the year 71 (acknowledgment made by quotations from these books), asserts the truth of the Gospel history, relatively to the destruction of Jerusalem. But not to insist on this, Barnabas, who is placed by Lardner as early as the year 71, says, speaking of the Jews and the temple, "And so it came to pass; for through their means it is now destroyed by their enemies." This was long before the fourth century; and, to adopt your own words, it "is something like substantive proof" of another error.—(L. i. p. 17, 18.)

Mr. C.—In answer to your disproof of my assertion, I refer you to the "Republican," Vol. ix. No. 1.

Mr. B.—Thither have I gone; but instead of finding Barnabas, whom I quoted, brought down below the fourth century, as was essential to the verification of your asser-

tion, not a word have I there found as to the age in which he flourished. However, to make security doubly secure, take a quotation from Minutius Felix (210). "Learn the fate of the Jews from Josephus, or from Antonius Julianus. Whence you will find, that, by their turpitude, they had merited their fate, and that they suffered nothing which had not been predicted should await them, if they persisted in their contumacy. Thus they were not deserted, till they themselves had deserted God."—(L. ii. p. 57.)

Mr. C.—In the Old Testament, we read nothing of a place called Golgotha, or Mount Calvary, or the pool of Siloam; and hence all these places are of Christian invention.

Mr. B.—Here, a strict logician would demur: he would remind you of the time that had elapsed between the date of the last book of the Old Testament and that of the book of the New. He would be disposed to think it very possible, that during an interval of some hundred years, places might have exchanged their old for new appellations. And if he were an Englishman, the history of Great Britain would furnish him some good confirmation of his suggestion. But in the Old Testament, we do read of a place called Golgotha, or which is the same, Gilgal, for Golgotha is only the Chaldee form of the Hebrew word Gilgal, of which Calvary is the Latin designation.—See Joshua, v. 9; Judges ii. 1. Such a *place*, is, therefore, "read of." But the Gilgal of the Old Testament is not the Calvary of the New. The first was near Jericho, the second is on the north-west of Jerusalem. And though Calvary is not mentioned in the Old Testament, the mountain of which it is a part, is mentioned, *viz.* Mount Moriah, 2 Chron. iii. 1. And that Calvary is a part of Mount Moriah, may be learned from Dr. Wells, in his Geography of the New Testament: "Calvary, a hill upon the great Mount of Moriah." The difficulty, then, which presses on Christianity, is not the fabrication of a place never before heard of, but the ascribing to some petty hill near Jerusalem, a name not given to it in a book written some centuries before it took its rise. Truly, a mighty matter! But this is no difficulty to me: I mean to say, rather, it is a confirmation of the veracity of the historians. I expect these minor varieties in every true history. I am led to do so by experience. But, Sir, you should have looked into a Concordance again, before you asserted

that Siloam was not spoken of in the Old Testament. In Nehemiah iii. 15, the word, a little varied in the English, occurs, Siloah. If this had not satisfied you, by referring to Josephus (Book v. Chap. xi. Jewish Wars), you would have learned that this name, at least, was not "of Christian invention." "Siloam—that it is the name of a fountain near Jerusalem, which hath sweet water in it, and this in great plenty also."—(L. i. p. 18, 19.)

(To be Continued.)

The Close of the Year.

Hush! 'tis the deep and solemn midnight sound,
Which breaks with startling accents on the ear;
Time in his ceaseless, quick, and changeless round
Has struck the knell of the departed year!
Onward and onward still? No pause to weep?
No tear for scenes of death and early blight?
Yes! as the restless billows of the deep
Pause to lament the victims of their might!

Hark! as Eternity's grim herald flies
Swift on his wide career,
Deep-sounding from his aged lips arise
Tales of the by-gone year!

The songs of mirth have sounded,
And laughing eyes have beam'd;
The joyous hearts have bounded,
As life's gay summer gleam'd:
And youthful knees have bended
Before love's holy shrine,
And kindred souls have blended
In unison divine.—

But sorrow's mournful voice hath spoken:
Those laughing eyes that shone
Are closed and dim; those hearts are broken,
Their sunny days are gone:
The youthful limbs that bow'd, have wasted;
Love's burning fane is low;
The kindred hearts that lov'd, have tasted
The bitter cup of woe!

The brazen trump hath waken'd echoes,
From valley green,
And mountain steep;
The clarion shrill, hath pierced the grottoes,
Where all unseen
The wood-nymphs sleep:
For with laurell'd brow, and blooming face,
The victor came
'Midst shouts of glory;
He had fought, and won a warrior's place,
And shrined his name
In deathless story!—

Th' inspiring martial notes are hush'd,
No echoes answer back;
He fought again—his limbs lay crush'd
Upon the chariot-track:
And thousand childless mothers' moans
His gilded coffin meet,
And widows' shrieks, and orphans' groans,
His formless body greet!

And Music o'er the wond'ring throng,
Hath pour'd her mighty tide of song;
With god-like spell,
The listening world enchain'd,
Which yielding fell
Enraptured, unrestrain'd.

And Poesy hath waked the tuneful lyre,
By myriad angels strung,
Which, touch'd in cadence sweet, or swept in fire,
Its varied accents flung.

And Eloquence, with mighty words,
Hath calm'd the raging storm,
Hath pierced the soul—touch'd *all* its chords,
As Freedom's fading form
Faintly exclaim'd, "No *God* decreed
That millions bow to one;
That thousand noble hearts should bleed,
To prop a tyrant's throne!"

The voice of Fate hath spoken!—
Low lies the clay-cold head;
And Music's spell is broken,
That master-hand is dead.

Unheeded droops, no more to rise,
That harp of song;
For silently the Poet lies
The dead among.

That melting voice of Eloquence is chill'd,
And gone for aye the fleeting breath;
The tongue which charm'd, the eye which glanced, are still'd—
Food for the worm that lives on Death.

And this the oft *repeated* tale,
(*Remembered* never)
That human strength too soon must fail,
And sink for ever.

The hand of Death will quickly fall
On forms now gay and young;
O'er us will wave the sable pall—
Dirges for us be sung.

Let us, then, as the hours
Pass rapidly,
Remember this—
Present alone is ours,
Future is *His*
Who reigns on high. H. M. B.

REVIEW.

"*A Testimony for an Universal Church.—By John Fleming, Airdrie.*"

We notice this work of 620 pages, in which the author, with all the infallibility of the dictator of Spiritual Babylon, consigns to detestation and damnation, all sects which do not coincide in opinion with his own, merely to place on record, as a specimen of the orthodoxy and intolerance yet existing in Scotland, the following passages. The

price of the publication, we trust, will render its bigotry harmless; but it is a melancholy exhibition of fanatical pride and sectarian presumption. There needs no other argument to show the necessity of Reformation in Scotland, and of every friend of human happiness putting forth his utmost exertions, to advance the progress of truth and charity, than this strange and incoherent mass of bigotry. We pity those who have to peruse the book; we pity him more who is its author. The conclusion of his tirade against Unitarianism, is all we think it necessary to quote.

"In the contemplation of Unitarianism, every thing sorrowful forces itself on our observation. This fatal system takes away the possibility of salvation for sinners. It consigns to eternal misery, in the place of weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth, Adam, and all his posterity, with the last of his race. Unitarians pretend the dread of idolatry, as the reason for conceiving of God as they do;—that he exists in one person only. But in fearing idolatry, Unitarians, against all possible evidence of the truth, that Jehovah in the three persons of the godhead, is the true God, worship an idol. The God of the Unitarians, is as much a god of their own invention, as the gods of the heathen, are the invention of their idolatrous worshippers; and, by the Unitarian's own confession, as the god of the Mahometans, is of his Mahometan worshippers. Is it then to be wondered at, that God should send Unitarians strong delusion to believe a lie, that they all may be damned?

"The salvation of Unitarians, is, on many accounts, perfectly hopeless. Their dreadful impiety, in mutilating the Scriptures, and adding to them, exposes them to all the plagues, which are written in these sacred writings. Jehovah says; 'I testify to every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book; if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues which are written in this book. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book,' Rev. xxii. 18, 19. Adding to, and taking away from the words of the book of God, is eminently true of Unitarians; and therefore those awful threatenings, against such as do so, must necessarily be executed upon Unitarians. But desperate as the condition of Unitarians is; still Jehovah, whose existence they deny, proclaims; 'Hearken unto me, ye stout-hearted that are far from righteousness; I bring near my righteousness, it shall not be far off; and my salvation shall not tarry.'

"Unitarianism, till lately, was little known in this country. We knew of it by report only, as we know of an evil at a distance, or by books; as we know of some ancient heresies. The first who rose to distinction among us, in the profession of Unitarianism, was Mr. Yates, who was a Unitarian preacher and writer in Glasgow. Under the management of Mr. Yates, who, we be-

lieve, is still alive, [wonderful!] a Unitarian society was organized in that city. This society still exists, and according to our observation, discovers, much, the seductive power of the Unitarian heresy in Glasgow. This city appears to be the principal seat of Unitarianism, north of the Tweed, as we do not know of any other organized Unitarian society in Scotland. There are, we believe, in this country, other societies of this description; but their members are few, and the societies themselves, in respect to being known, obscure. But though Unitarians, generally, are restrained from making a public profession of their religious sentiments, they are, nevertheless, increasing, and their zeal is becoming more vehement. The book which Yates has written in defence of Unitarianism, and the Unitarian society in Glasgow, being unashamed of the blasphemy of its religious system, and not contemptible in number, is a clear proof of the increase of Unitarianism, in both the number and zeal of its adherents. Of such an increase, in other places, we have certain information.

"This fatal heresy, probably, may continue to increase for a considerable time. One strong reason for thinking so, is derived not so much from the general great corruption, and prevailing degeneracy of the present time, though this is sufficient ground of apprehension, as from a prophecy of John in his revelations. John prophesies, 'Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea, for,' says he, 'the Devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.' This short time, however, appears to refer to the whole length of the time of Antichrist's reign, or of the papal power, from the period of its commencement, to its fall. This great wrath of Satan, during the time past of popery, hath been displayed in various ways, for the destruction of both his enemies and friends. One way frequently taken by the Devil to show his wrath, has been to raise persecution for conscience' sake. To excite to persecution, has not been in Satan's power for some time past. The Devil must therefore have recourse to other expedients, for destroying in his wrath the objects of his malice,—mankind. Unitarianism, is one of the ways the Devil is now adopting, for pouring out his wrath on poor sinners, for their everlasting ruin. This device, wonderfully displays the wrathful ingenuity of the old serpent, called the Devil and Satan, as Unitarianism, persisted in, most infallibly secures the everlasting destruction of the Unitarian, in the place of endless woe, prepared for the Devil and his angels. When Antichrist or Popery is fallen, and the time of this fall is at hand, the Devil is to be put under great restraint, or, as John expresses this limitation of Satan's power, 'bound with a chain.' Rev. xx. 1–3. The Devil knows this, and having now but a short time, his great wrath may be expected to be displayed, in the continuance and increase of Unitarianism!

"But shall Unitarianism exist and increase, and shall there be none to bear testimony against this fatal heresy; this ruinous delusion; this chief of the ways of Satan for the interminable destruction of men? All believers in Christ; all who have any concern for the salvation of Christ; all who would defend the

honour of God our Saviour; all who put any value on his precious truths; all who wish that sinners should be preserved from eternal misery; all who resist the Devil in his attempts for the everlasting destruction of men; all who agree with us in our testimony against Unitarianism; all Unitarians themselves, who have any regard to their own salvation, are called on, as with a voice from heaven, not to fear the wrath of the Devil, in the great power he is exerting to promote Unitarianism; to stir up all your zeal, and combine all your efforts, to oppose the progress of this fatal heresy; and to exert all your influence with the Hearer of prayer, that the perishing Unitarian, be rescued from his destructive delusion, and that though living and dying in Unitarian unbelief, he be not punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power! Why should not we now resist the Devil, though on the throne of his power, which he is showing in the success of his designs, to seduce into Unitarianism, and by this seduction, to destroy those he has deceived? The time for the exertion of this great power is passing away. By and bye, he shall be cast into the bottomless pit, and shut up, that for a long time he shall deceive man no more into hopeless Unitarianism."[!!!]

"*The Duty and Benefits of Co-operation among the Friends of Scriptural Christianity; a Sermon preached in the Meeting-House of the Second Presbyterain Congregation, Belfast, on Sunday, the 26th of August,* 1827.—*By Hugh Hutton, M. A. Minister of the Old Meeting-House, Birmingham.*"

"*The Effect of Man's Wrath in the Agitation of Religious Controversies; a Sermon preached at the Opening of the New Presbyterian Chapel in Belfast, on Sabbath, September* 23, 1827.—*By Thomas Chalmers, D. D. Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of St. Andrews.*"

We place these discourses together, for though delivered on different occasions, they agree in one object, the inculcation of Christian benevolence. Mr. Hutton's is, of course, more especially addressed to those who "acknowledge no master in religion, but Christ; no creed-book, but the Bible; no test of sound doctrine, but the unambiguous declarations of Jesus and his Apostles." He urges on his auditors the indispensable obligations of that charity which is the bond of perfectness, but at the same time he warns them against clothing indifference to God's truth and human happiness, under the hallowed title. He

shows clearly, that uniformity of opinion is not the true Christian test; but that harmony of affection is the best evidence of having been with Jesus. He calls on all who value Gospel liberty and undefiled religion, to band themselves in holy brotherhood, that the weak may be encouraged, the persecuted shielded, and truth and righteousness advanced. The following appeal should be sufficient for that purpose; and we trust the friends of mental emancipation and scriptural truth in Ireland, will prove by their conduct that it is so.

"It is no uncommon thing in the religious world, for an outcry to be raised against opinions, without any knowledge of their nature or evidence, and for aspersions to be cast on the characters and motives of their professors, for no other reason, but because they are known to be dissenters from the creed of the multitude. Thus men of honest minds and of a Scriptural faith, who have followed the dictates of conscience in rejecting the dogmas of the popular theology, are held forward to the indignation and contempt of the uninquiring majority, as schismatics, infidels, atheists, enemies of the Saviour, and deniers of the Scriptures; and thousands, with kind hearts and good intentions, are led astray by these alarming representations, to refuse to the persons designated by these reproachful epithets, any share in their Christian or neighbourly communion. Of this species of persecution, of which the credulous and unsuspecting many are the instruments, but whose authors are the interested few, whose emoluments or preferments, or ambitious hopes, or worldly influence, are most likely to be secured by the continuance of things as they are, every man who dares to think for himself and to avow his sentiments, is at some period of his life the object.

"Besides the personal inconveniences, which are many, attending these misrepresentations, there is this additional disadvantage, that they excite and keep alive a suspicion against a man's principles, which deprives them of all chance of being patiently and impartially examined. The ears of multitudes are for ever closed against a hearing of the truth, by the influence of their first impressions, received from the calumnious charges and insinuations of its adversaries. But for this, if not for the other evils, there is a remedy, in the open and fearless vindication of our principles; by which the minds of our brethren will be undeceived, and the bold assertions of ignorance and malice put to silence. Let a public and united testimony be borne to any set of opinions by those who hold them, and the world will have a fair opportunity of learning the real character of their doctrines, and be in little danger of remaining the dupe of false statements, and imperfect or exaggerated descriptions. Those who are accustomed by habit or inclination, to speak evil of the things which they know not, will be deterred from giving utterance to their unfounded accusations, when they are aware, that a ready contradiction can be returned to them, by the very persons whom they wish to preju-

dice against the sentiments which are obnoxious to themselves. The voice of railing is generally loudest, when there appears a backwardness in the person accused, to repel its charges before the public tribunal, or when the object of attack, enjoys not the protection of a community, heartily disposed towards the same cause."

"The infirmities of human nature are many; and the points of weakness at which it may be tempted, are often connected with some of the most amiable parts of the character. The claims of friendship, the ties of domestic affection, the anxieties of paternal tenderness, are not unfrequently the medium, through which the attack is made on the mind's integrity: and if the person thus besieged by strong temptation, finds himself alone in the struggle; unsupported by the sympathy and aid of other firmer spirits; with want, desertion, scorn, in prospect, as the consequences of resistance; is it to be wondered at, that he falls beneath the power that assails him, and loses his best possession, his sincerity, his honour, his peace of mind? Alas, no! and though such submission to the degrading terms of worldly feeling and worldly interest, cannot be defended on any principles of right reason or religious duty; yet it is but too natural, and too common among mankind. Is it not a work of benevolence, an obligation of Christian virtue, to attempt the prevention of such sacrifices? Is it not a duty, arising out of our profession of love for God and man, to do what we can, to save our fellow-creatures from these shipwrecks of conscience, and to encourage them by our exhortation and example, to cling fast to honesty and godly sincerity, through all the storms and billows that may arise to annoy their course? There is no man, possessed of a well-regulated mind, that does not derive spirit and energy from the society of his fellow-men, engaged in the same undertaking with himself. Emulation, like sorrow, is contagious; and the zeal and determination, manifested by the more active labourers in a good cause, will soon be communicated to all who have that cause really at heart.

"The private persecutor, who wounds by slander, and the open persecutor, who takes credit to himself for candour and honesty, while he unblusingly avails himself of any means, however treacherous, which circumstances may place within his reach, for the injuring of the object of his enmity; both aim their blows with greater confidence and more certain aim, when their victim is single, and destitute of protection. But when many arms are ready to be raised in his defence, their assaults are less frequent and less successful. The weapons of bigotry, would be rendered useless in her hands, were all the assertors of the rights of conscience, and of the claims of Scriptural Christianity, to stand forward in one united phalanx, to brave her utmost force, and to liberate from her grasp every struggling victim, whom she is preparing to destroy."

Dr. Chalmers' text is James i. 20: "The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." His illustrations of this important truth are admirable.

"When God beseeches us to be reconciled to him in Christ Jesus, there is placed before the mind one object of contemplation.

When man steps forward, and, in the pride or intolerance of orthodoxy, denounces the fury of an incensed God on all who put not faith in the merits and the mediation of his Son, there is placed before the mind another and a distinct object of contemplation. And just in proportion to the varieties of dogmatism or debate, will the mind shift and fluctuate from one contemplation to another. Certain it is, that it must feel a different sort of affection, when directly engaged with the love of God in heaven, from what it does when tossed and alternated among the wrathful elements of human controversy upon earth. It then breathes in another atmosphere; and the whole sense and savour of the encompassing medium feel differently from before. And still it comes to the same important, but unhappy result, as if the music of the spheres had been drowned in the rude and resentful outcry of noises from beneath, and the ear had failed to catch the utterance of heaven's inspiration, because lost and overborne amid sounds of earthliness. It is thus that the native character of Heaven's embassy may at length be shrouded in subtle, but most effectual disguise, from the souls of men; and the whole spirit and design of its munificent Sovereign be wholly misconceived by his sinful, yet much-loved children. We interpret the Deity by the hard and imperious scowl which sits on the countenance of angry theologians; and in the strife and clamour of their fierce animosities, we forget the aspect of Him who is upon the throne, the bland and benignant aspect of that God who waiteth to be gracious.

"It is thus that men of highest respect in the Christian world have done grievous injury to the cause. Whether, we ask, would Calvin have found readier acceptance for his own favourite doctrine of justification by the righteousness of Christ, (that only righteousness which God will accept in plea of our meritorious claim to the kingdom of heaven, and, therefore, called the righteousness of God,)—whether was it likelier that he should have gained the consent of men's minds to this method of salvation, by declaring it in the spirit of gentleness, and with the accents of entreaty, or by denouncing it in the spirit of an incensed polemic, and with that aspect which sits on his pages of severe and relentless dogmatism? Would it not have strengthened his cause, had he, in propounding the message of reconciliation to his fellows upon earth, caught more upon his heart of the benignity which prompted the sending of that message from heaven?—and had the eye, the voice, the manner of this able expounder of the counsels of God, represented more of the kindness which presided over these counsels, of the compassion felt in the upper sanctuary, and which there originated the forthgoing of the Saviour on our guilty world? Certain it is, that there is nought to conciliate the spirits of men to the doctrine of Calvin, all true, and all momentous as it is, in that wrath which glares upon us so repeatedly from the dark and angry passages of his argument. That violence and vituperation, by which his Institutes are so frequently deformed, never do occur, we venture to affirm, but with an adverse influence on the minds of his readers, in reference to the truth which he espouses. In other words, that truth which, when couched in the language, and accompanied with the calls of affec-

tion, finds such welcome into the hearts of men, hath brought upon its propounders the re-action of stout indignant hostility, and just because of the stern intolerance wherewith it has been proposed by them. This difference, in point of effect, between the meek and the magisterial style of instruction, makes it of the utmost practical importance, that neither the pride nor the passions of men should mingle in the discussion, when labouring either with or against each other in the common pursuit of truth. For much has it prejudiced the cause of truth in the world, that it has so oft been urged and insisted on with that wrath of man, which, most assuredly, worketh not the righteousness of God."

Would that this passage could be heard, and its spirit be imbibed, throughout Christendom! We fervently hope, that the Professor of Divinity will ever act on these principles of the Professor of Moral Philosophy; and the inculcation of such sentiments, from the theological chair of Edinburgh, cannot fail of producing lasting and extensive good. Practically embraced, it would dissipate religious sullenness, and uproot bigotry, and draw closer to each other, those whom now the angry scowl of fanaticism separates.

In reference to the controversy between Trinitarians and Unitarians, the Doctor says:

"It can require no very deep insight into our nature to perceive, that when there is proud or angry intolerance on the side of truth, it must call forth the re-action of a sullen and determined obstinacy on the side of error. Men will submit to be reasoned out of an opinion, and more especially when treated with respect and kindness. But they will not submit to be cavalierly driven out of it. There is a revolt in the human spirit against contempt and contumely, insomuch, that the soundest cause is sure to suffer from the help of such auxiliaries. When passion is enlisted on one side of a controversy, then provocation is awakened on the other side,—and the parties erecting themselves into stouter and loftier attitude than before, stand to each other in respective positions which are mutually impregnable. It is this infusion of temper by which the force, even of mightiest argument, is paralyzed. It is when disdain meets with defiance, when exasperating charges meet with indignant recriminations, when the shouts of exulting victory may sting the bosom of adversaries with the humiliations, but never draw from their lips the acknowledgments of defeat,—it is when the war of words is animated with feelings such as these, that Truth, whose still small voice is all-powerful, falls from her omnipotence and her glory, and Falsehood, resolute in the midst of such stormy agitations, is only rivetted thereby more firmly upon her basis. To the perversity of human error, there is now superadded the still more hopeless perversity of human wilfulness—and on looking at the whole resulting amount from these fulminations of heated partizanship, one cannot fail to acknowledge, that indeed the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God."

Who, that has a mind open to conviction, or a heart capable of feeling an ardent love of liberty, for others as well as himself, can fail to be impressed with the passage in relation to the degraded situation of the Catholics of Ireland?

"Theologians have forgotten it in their controversies. Statesmen have forgotten it in their laws. Never was there a greater blunder in legislation, than that by which the forces of the statute-book have been enlisted on the side of truth; and error, as was quite natural, instead of being subdued, has been thereby settled down into tenfold obstinacy. The glories of martyrdom have been transferred from the right to the wrong side of the question; and superstition, which, in a land of perfect light and perfect liberty, would hide her head as ashamed, gathers a title to respect, and stands forth in a character of moral heroism, because of the injustice which has been brought to bear upon her. She ought, in all wisdom, to have been left to her own natural decay—or, at least, reason and kindness are the only engines which should have been made to play upon her strong-holds. But with such an auxiliary, as the mere authority of terror upon the one side, and such a resistance as that of a generous and high-minded indignation upon the other—there have arisen the elements of an interminable warfare. And not till truth, relieved of so unseemly an associate, be confined to the use of her proper weapons, will she be reinstated on her proper vantage ground. It is not in the fermentation of human passions and human politics, that the lessons of heaven can be with efficacy taught; and ere these lessons shall go abroad in triumph over the length and breadth of the land, we must recal the impolicy by which we have turned a whole people into a nation of outcasts. To exclude is surely not the way to assimilate. It is by pervading, instead of separating into an unbroken mass, and then placing it off at a distance from us; it is by extensively mingling with the men of another denomination, in all the walks of civil and political business; it is then, that the occasions of converse and of courtesy will be indefinitely multiplied; and then will it be found, that it is by an influence altogether opposite to the wrath of man, that we are enabled to work the righteousness of God."

"*A Letter to the Protestant-Dissenters in the Parish of Ballykelly, Ireland; occasioned by their objections against their late Minister: By John Nelson.*—1766."

THE first objection made to Mr. Nelson's ministry, was, that he opposed human creeds and confessions. To this he replies, "It may be doubted whether most creeds and confessions, even where they contain nothing but the truth, be so well calculated for the instruction of young people,

as the Sacred Scriptures: their manner of expression is generally too abstracted to be readily entered into by a youthful giddy mind. For the illustration of this, let us attend to the answer given to this question in our Shorter Catechism: 'What is God?' Ans. 'God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth.' To the justness of this, I have no objection. It is an excellent summary of the divine perfections. Would to God it were always present to our minds, in our reasonings concerning the divine conduct! But is it readily apprehended by a mind that has not yet formed exact notions of what *holiness, equity, wisdom,* or *goodness* are in themselves? Would it not affect a child more to be acquainted with the actions of God, related in sacred history, where instruction and entertainment are agreeably intermixed? A man's real character is best known by his actions, and so is the character of God himself. This method of engaging the attention of youth, is the more necessary, that in this period of life their judgments are weak, but their memories very tenacious of interesting facts. Let a child open the Bible, where the story of Joseph is told with such a charming simplicity, and how clearly will he be convinced, that in the most gloomy dispensations, God is the never-failing friend of the righteous, while vice, in the greatest pomp, is the object of his abhorrence. In what catechism shall we find a dry catalogue of the divine perfections so well adapted to make a lasting impression upon the minds of youth, that in the practice of virtue, they may be assured to continue the favourites of heaven, even in the deepest distress, and sooner or later, to be delivered from it all and crowned with glory?

There are other things in our Catechism much more above the capacities of children. In answer to the first question, we are told, that the chief end of man is to glorify God: a most certain truth. But you might as well speak Hebrew to a child. How many persons, when grown up, have clear notions of what is meant by glorifying God? or of the nature or end of man? In short, the first part of this Catechism is evidently wrote in such scholastic language, upon the different subjects of controversial divinity, where the learned have never been able to understand one another, nor themselves, that for real instruction, you might as well send youth to the darkest

problem in Algebra. Some, indeed, lay it down as a principle, that children should store their memories with words at first, from a presumption that they will come to understand them afterwards. But, besides the disagreeable impression such a drudgery must make upon a young mind, which is of more consequence than we generally attend to, is it not the original design of words to convey the knowledge of the things signified by them? What sense, then, is there in separating the one from the other; or in stringing words together without any regard to the meaning of them? Is there any thing worth knowing, but may be expressed in language plain enough to be understood by every mind that can enter into the subject spoken of? Until it grows capable of the one, why should the other be pressed upon it? We can all see the absurdity of giving a child food that is too strong for its digestive powers. But is it not equally applicable to the mind and the body, that there should be *milk for babes?* One obvious mischief, arising from the violation of this rule, is, that by the familiar use and frequent repetition of mere words, people are insensibly led to imagine, that they understand them. Hence the mind, without perceiving it, is often stored with unmeaning sounds and conceit, instead of knowledge; or, which is still worse, where the language is plain, but the sentiment false, learners rashly swallow it before their judgments are ripened, and carry these notions to the Bible as principles of Christianity.

"A lady in this kingdom some time ago, having a negro servant, was charitable enough to desire he might be instructed in the Christian religion; for this purpose she put him under the care of a teacher, who, according to custom, furnished him with Catechisms, commented upon them, and made a favourable report of the quickness of his understanding: this the pious lady, in the joy of her heart for saving a soul, mentioned to a clergyman of her acquaintance, adding her request, that he would examine her servant; with this he readily complied, and asked such simple questions as these: 'Who was the author of the Christian religion?' 'Where Jesus Christ came from?' or, 'What he came to do in the world?' To none of which was any reply made. 'My lad,' says the clergyman, 'I have been informed you understand the principles of Christianity;' 'and so I do, Sir,' returns the other; 'and pray,' says the parson, 'what are these principles?' To which he replied,

expressing his opinions in his own words, from the confusion he was in, 'these, Sir, are the principles of the Christian religion, *there was an old man and an old woman that robbed an orchard long ago, and for this we are all damned ever since.*'—A lovely religion to be sure, if these are the principles of it! What opinion would the poor negro, from the mere light of nature, entertain of the equity or goodness of the Judge of all the earth, of whom he was taught to believe such things? Certainly, however he might be afraid to speak it out, yet he would not in his heart esteem him much above the gods he had formerly worshipped; perhaps not equal to them, for this plain reason, that he had probably never heard of their doing such a *wicked thing.* But Jesus never taught this as a principle of his holy religion; his instructions, however, are not put into the hands of learners. A strange backward method is here observed by most Christians, to which they are bound with a pious care by their teachers. They learn their religion from their several manuals, and then bring the Bible to speak their sense; instead of taking their religious sentiments immediately from the Bible itself: this is the fruitful source of all the errors keenly maintained in the world. A cask long retains the flavour of the liquor first put into it; but it is much more difficult to purify the human mind from the first impressions, however foul they may be."

(To be Continued.)

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *January* 1, 1828.

AMERICAN QUAKERS.—WE noticed the important questions agitating in this body, in our last Number. The friends of Christian liberty, and opposers of creed corruption, invited those who thought with them, to send Delegates to Philadelphia, for the formation of a Yearly Meeting on these principles, to assemble in October last. This Meeting was accordingly held, and upwards of fifty out of sixty-four Monthly Meetings, composing the old Orthodox Yearly Meeting, sent Representatives to the new Yearly Meeting. There were present, two thousand men and fifteen hundred women. Probably seven-eighths of the Pennsylvanian Quakers reject the doctrine of the Trinity, and its concomitant opinions; and advocate the Oneness of Deity, and perfect freedom of conscience and inquiry. About the same proportion prevails in the state of New-York; but, as the leading and influential ministers are on the side of Christian liberty, there will probably there be no division.

The Rev. B. Mardon has resigned the Congregation at Maidstone, and accepted an invitation to Worship-Street, London, as successor to the late highly respected and benevolent Dr. Evans.

Mr. Tagart having resigned the Congregation at Norwich, the Rev. W. J. Bakewell of Edinburgh, has been invited to succeed him.

The Rev. A. Melville, formerly student at the University of this City, has been chosen the Minister of the Unitarian Congregation at Ipswich.

We have just received the following lines. We cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of their insertion. They breathe so sweet and pure a spirit, that we can form no better wish for our friends, at the commencement of another year, than that they may find a responsive feeling in every heart.

The circling months have glided on,
Like the shade round the dial;
With equal pace their days have flown,
Whether in joy or trial.

Another period hath pass'd
Of thine allotted age;
And of his many-leaved book
Time hath turn'd o'er a page.

Mortal! that page!—'tis closed now
From every human eye;
But thou canst still its characters
By memory's light descry.

If on the record be inscribed
The deeds of truth and love;
If humbly thou hast held thy course,
In fear of God above;

If it has been thy heart's warm wish,
To fit thyself for Heaven,
Though thou hast often weakly err'd,
Still hope to be forgiven.

Though many clouds have o'er thee lower'd,
And suns forgot to shine,
And woe its bitter cup hath pour'd,—
Mortal! let joy be thine.

But, if upon that page there be
No deed of kindness traced;
If meekness, love, and piety,
Have not thy actions graced;

Although in ease thy days have pass'd,
And wealth hath gilt the scene;
If thou unmindful, midst the gifts,
Hast of the Giver been,—

Weep, Mortal! weep, for thou hast lost
What none on earth can give;
And humbly kneel, and pray that thou
Another year may'st live.

Haply thy tears of penitence
May wash away thy sin;
And thine unwearied diligence
May yet thy pardon win.

R.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 18. FEBRUARY, 1828. Vol. II.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures.

(Continued from page 154.)

LET us now proceed to the writings of the New Testament, some of which are historical, others epistolary.

The author or founder of our religion, is Jesus Christ. By his name we are called. The Apostles are also, sometimes, called founders;* but not in the same sense as Christ. He laid the foundation of the general Church. They were his instruments in raising the superstructure. He is that Prophet whom God raised up, whom we are bound to hear in all things.† He is the deputed Lawgiver, from whose mouth we have received the law of God, as the people of old did by the mouth of Moses. Christ is the Mediator of a new and better covenant. As he had his appointment from God, as his divine authority was attested, beyond all possibility of doubt, by miracles, by a voice from heaven, by his resurrection from the dead, we are bound to attend to him, since God, in these latter days, has spoken to us by his Son.

Christ has not left to the world, any record of his doctrine written by himself. He asserted himself to be the promised Messiah—the Christ; he proved his divine authority by his miracles; he declared, that the end of his mission was to save the world—to reconcile man to God. He gave but few new precepts; but he confirmed the dictates of natural reason by divine authority; he gave a new sanction to the moral precepts of the Mosaic religion, by the promise of eternal life. He broke down the partition-wall between Jew and Gentile, and enlarged the Church of God. He rescued the true principles of nature and reason, from the false glosses of pharisaical teachers, which had perverted the very design of the Mosaical precepts. He restored decayed religion, but neither gave nor insisted upon any positive institutions. All this he did by oral instruction.

* Rom. xv. 20. 1 Cor. iii. 10. † Acts iii. 22; vii. 37.

When he commissioned his Apostles—when he first sent out his seventy disciples to plant and propagate the Gospel, we have no intimation that he gave them any charge to digest any form of written laws, nor, indeed, to leave any writing at all. I do not mean to say, that, by writing, they exceeded their authority. They were commanded to teach and to preach, consequently, they were to do this in any way which they thought would most effectually promote the purpose of their mission. To this day, his followers have the same authority. The doctrine which they taught, was that which was so frequently termed the Word of God, before any particle of it was committed to writing. In the primitive Church, no written authority was looked for, thought of, or ever expected. It no where appears, that the authors of the New Testament ever thought of collecting their several writings into one volume; or that they ever expected they would be so collected at any future time, and then quoted and referred to as the immediate dictate of the Holy Spirit, as is now the case, when every text is quoted as the Word of God, when we are repeatedly told, that the Holy Spirit says thus and thus in such a chapter and verse. In the New Testament writings themselves, we find no such appeal. Peter once makes mention of St. Paul's writings, but not under the notion of an inspired law.* Luke, the only authentic historian of the early times of Christianity after the death of Christ, makes no mention of any inspired writings, or of any texts taken from them by the first teachers of Christianity, to prove any point of doctrine. But after they were written, undoubtedly the Gospels and the several Epistles were read in the different churches.

Of all those who were immediately commissioned by Christ, few committed any thing to writing, though all had the same commission; and of what they did write, it is probable we have but little left. It is quite clear, that Paul wrote more than has come down to us;† and when he had written many letters, and found his authority despised,‡ he vindicated himself, but not his letters. He never asserted that they were the dictates of immediate inspiration, and that he was only the amanuensis.

The writings of the New Testament are invaluable.

---

* 1 Peter iii. 16. † Col. iv. 16; 1 Cor. v. 9.
‡ 1 Cor. iii. 4, 5; 2 Cor. x. 10.

Of the truth of their contents, of the fidelity of the writers, I have not the shadow of a doubt. The historical books contain a record of what Jesus did—of what he taught—of his miraculous actions—of his death, his resurrection, and ascension. The Evangelists related what they saw, and what they heard, during the time that they were continually with Jesus; they could not be deceived—they had no motive nor any inclination to deceive. But these writers make no pretensions to inspiration in writing their narratives. They have given an account of what they knew, either by the evidence of their own senses, or by the testimony of others, on whose fidelity they knew they could rely. Luke particularly tell us, that as others had given an account of the things which are believed among Christians, on the report of those who had from the beginning been eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, so he also, though not taxing the others with falsehood or misrepresentation, yet, having a perfect knowledge of all the transactions from the beginning, undertook to give an account of them. He does not say, that he had obtained this perfect knowledge from revelation—from immediate inspiration, but, as others had done, from credible witnesses. If any one should say, that all must be written by inspiration, or else our faith can have no firm foundation, this is not only an assertion without proof, but an assertion that tends to subvert Christianity. Since the originals being all perished, we have nothing but transcripts or printed copies remaining, and no one can say that every successive copy was guided by divine impulse.

We have, I think, every assurance possible, of the fidelity of the writers of these books, much more so, in my opinion, than we have of many authors whose statements are never called in question. But in reading them, it is necessary that we should make a distinction between what they report as coming from the mouth of Christ, and what are merely their own remarks and observations: such, for instance, as the Proem to St. John's Gospel, and their applications of the Old Testament in the way of proof, allusion, or argument. We ought to be aware, that Christ, most probably, conversed in Syriac; that the Evangelists, therefore, record his words in a translation, in which they frequently do not record the whole, and what they do, not in the same order in which it was spoken. A diligent reader, by comparing the Evangelists, may frequently dis-

cover this. Not that they vary in any point important to religion. The oriental manner of teaching was allegorical, and sometimes not very obvious to our understanding: this may occasion some obscurity in many passages, if not explained by others that are more clear; and it is generally allowed, that many quotations and references to passages in the Old Testament, are only allusions, not intended as proofs of what they are applied to, but simply as illustrations.*

The authors of some of the Epistles, were unknown before the several books of the New Testament were collected. The Epistle to the Hebrews for instance, and that which bears the name of St. James. Some commentators have asserted, that it cannot be of any importance to know who were the authors of the several books, since they all carry in themselves the characteristics of divine inspiration, and whoever was the writer, the Holy Ghost was the dictator. But how or whence do they know this? Some will say, From the grandeur, the perspicuity of the style, which is far beyond the reach of any human author; and yet these same persons, after making this assertion, will immediately paraphrase many passages, either, I suppose, to mend the style, or to make it more clearly intelligible. And frequently men of equal abilities, equal piety, and equal learning, will stake their lives on the accuracy of interpretations, which are in direct opposition to each other. Others will say, They know it from the excellence—the purity of its contents, and by these they are certain, it can be no book of human composition. But, from what are their notions of purity and excellence derived? Are they not something like a man who should endeavour to prove the truth of the common standard of weights and measures, by their agreement with his own at home? To prove the truth of what is written, and that it is written by divine inspiration, are very different things. And whatever may be said of the Roman Church, I believe it is equally true among the generality of Protestants, that it is the Church which decides the Canon.

(To be Continued.)

---

* See Calvin on Heb. ii. 6, 7.—Hammond on Matt. ii. 22.

"*A Letter to the Protestant Dissenters in the Parish of Ballykelly, Ireland, occasioned by their objections to their late Minister.—By John Nelson.* 1766."

[In our last Number, page 176–179, as well as in No. XIII. p. 36, we made some extracts from this admirable address. We now continue them, deeming them as applicable now, as when their author originally penned them.]

"There are other things in this Confession still more hard to be understood, and in which it is of much greater importance for us to be rightly informed. Thus, chap. 9, sec. 3, we are told, that 'a natural man is not able to convert himself, nor to prepare himself thereunto;' and, chap. 16, sec. 7, that works done by unregenerate men, 'though they may be things which God commands, yet they are sinful and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God; and yet the neglect of them is more sinful and displeasing to God.' Every one at all acquainted with these authors, knows, that by a natural and unregenerate man, they mean the same character. How wretched, then, is this unregenerate man! and why should he pray to God for deliverance from this state? Since he 'cannot thereby convert himself, nor prepare himself thereunto:' nay, since this will be so far from making him meet to receive favour from God, that it will be a sin, according to this scheme. Must not the person who really believes this, be disposed, in the bitterness of his soul, to curse the author of his existence, who has brought him into being in such deplorable circumstances, that he cannot please God, but must sin, even by doing those things which God has commanded? How happy for us, that such distracting notions are seldom attended to by any body. Whence ariseth the necessity or expediency of calling upon any Christian, to profess that he believes these doctrines? Have they any other tendency than to put people mad, or to make them desperate and quite unconcerned about their conduct? Are they not contrary to the command of Jesus, enforced by his promise to the multitude, 'Ask, and ye shall receive?' And to the declaration of the Apostle Paul, that God 'will freely give his Holy Spirit to them that ask it?'

"It were easy to show, that the texts of Scripture brought to prove such opinions, are egregiously misapplied; but a particular explication of these would be inconsist-

ent with the brevity here intended: let the mention of a text, which these gentlemen advance for another opinion in their writings, serve as a specimen of their manner of quoting the Scriptures: this will show the force of religious prejudice, even in such great divines, especially in an age when the Bible had not been studied with sufficient exactness, after a reformation from some of the corruptions of Popery. Nor is this bearing too hard upon them: for, according to themselves, chap. 1, sec. 9, the 'only rule of interpretation of Scripture, is Scripture itself; by which all the doctrines of men are to be tried, and in whose sentence we are to rest.' In this spirit let us try one of their doctrines in the Shorter Catechism, that 'all mankind by the fall, to wit, of Adam and Eve, became liable to the pains of hell for ever.' To support this, among other Scriptures which any person may see to be equally impertinent, they produce Matt. xxv. 41, 'Then shall he say also to them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels:'—with verse 46, 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.' Now, whoever will be at the pains of turning to this place in his Bible, may perceive, without any labour or critical skill, that our Lord is not there speaking one word of what men may suffer for Adam's offence, but expressly informing his disciples, what the wicked shall in fact undergo for their own sins. 'For,' says he in the person of his followers, 'I was an hungry, and ye gave me no meat,' &c. Here we are taught by the faithful and true witness, that the dreadful sentence passed against the cursed, will be wholly owing to their own want of good affections, and not to a sin committed by another person thousands of years before they were made. About the meaning of this text, then, Jesus of Nazareth and the Westminster Divines entertained different opinions. And which of them you will believe, judge ye. This is but one of many texts referred to in this Confession, which have no sort of relation to what they are quoted for. Would people, that do not desire to be deceived, examine it fairly, they would see, that the authors of it were indeed fallible: an entire persuasion of which, would be of no small advantage to many Christians. But this would require a temper truly teachable, and some degree of application.

Supposing, then, a thing not impossible in itself, that an upright Christian, desirous to know the will of God, and to do it, should, after due inquiry, deny his assent to some opinions in this Confession; or see that the Scriptures of truth are injuriously treated, in being drawn in to prove very absurd tenets, by what rule of Christianity shall he be excluded from the enjoyment of Christian privileges? The Church of Rome professedly takes the Bible from the people; and to what purpose does the Church of Scotland leave it in their hands, if they must neither study it without fetters upon their minds, nor understand it in a sense different from the clergy, under the high penalty of being shut out from Christian communion, and delivered over to Satan? In this matter, there seems to be just as much difference between the conduct of the spiritual fathers in these two Churches, as there would be found between two natural parents, the one of whom would keep wholesome nourishing food from their children entirely, while the other would put it into their hands, but correct them severely for making use of it.

It is also evident, that many, in almost every Christian society, are so constantly employed in providing daily bread for their families, that they have little enough time left to spend upon a more useful book, that is—the Bible: where they may find true religion quite free from those corrupt glosses and false interpretations that poison the mind, and blind the understanding to such a degree, that it cannot discern the plainest truths.

In these and the like cases, is it not entangling men with an intolerable yoke of bondage, to insist upon an assent to the numerous, abstruse, and perplexed articles of this Confession? Are not such persons laid under an absolute necessity, either to act by an implicit faith, that is, to become Papists, or to abandon their Christian profession, or at least to desert its most solemn positive institutions? Why should the clergy exercise such a spiritual tyranny over God's heritage, not only without, but in direct opposition to the divine law? Is it not an apostolic precept, 'that no man put a stumbling-block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way?' Does not this conduct nearly resemble that of the Scribes and Pharisees, which our Saviour has branded with infamy, their binding heavy burdens, and grievous to be borne, and laying them upon other men's shoulders? Has he not treated such practices

with a pointed indignation, no where to be found in his other discourses? An awful warning to Christians to keep at the greatest distance from the appearance of such an evil.

Here it will be objected, that upon these principles we may receive the Papists into our communion, for they will readily acknowledge, that they believe the Bible. But this objection is founded upon very confused apprehensions of the matter of fact. For though every Papist of common sense, will indeed own that he believes the Bible, yet no Papist, who knows his principles, and acts up to them, will at all grant, that he believes the Bible alone to be the rule of his faith or religious obedience. No; all real Papists of every denomination, take only a part of their religion from the Bible; and along with this, join the doctrines and decisions of their respective synods and assemblies. Whenever any man renounces these, and adheres to the Bible alone, from that moment he renounces Popery. And why should he not be received with open arms? Shall it be said, that people take the Bible in different senses? What does this prove, but that they should enjoy their several opinions in peace? Let me ask, if the members of any church are agreed about the meaning of their favourite system of articles? Far from it. Though uniformity in sentiment is the foundation of all human establishments of religion, civil or ecclesiastic, yet every one finds by experience, that this is quite unattainable. Our situation will not admit of it. While men have different educations, capacities, books, company, &c. they will necessarily differ in opinion. The utmost we should aim at, is unity in affection. For all men can never be equally wise. And suppose some of the Church of Rome should daily count their beads, as the necessary means of carrying them to heaven, why should we hate them, or quarrel with them upon that account? What is the consequence when Christians bite and devour each other, but that they are naturally consumed one of another, and become the objects of just scorn to deists and infidels? And what are the chief instruments of those unchristian divisions, that have so miserably torn the Christian world, but the different systems of articles, that proud mortals, lording it over God's heritage, are cramming down their brethren's throats, whether they can swallow them or not?

That unity among the disciples of Jesus, is both prac-

ticable and extremely desirable, is evident from the solemn pathetic prayer of Christ to this purpose, in the 17th chapter of John; but do not human schemes of faith, set up as rules, standards, or tests, in the nature of the thing keep the different parties of Christians at an irreconcilable distance from each other? While the Church of Rome is devoted to the creeds composed by her old orthodox divines; and the Church of England no less warmly attached to the articles of her wise ancestors; and the Church of Scotland equally zealous for all the notions of her confession-makers: while this continues to be the case, can a union among these Churches be so much as hoped for? Without question, it cannot. Whereas, without these engines of discord, as there is but one Shepherd, so there might be but one sheep-fold. Then the distinguishing character which Jesus has given of his true disciples, would naturally take place. Having no cause to hate, they would love one another. There would be nothing to 'hurt or destroy in all God's holy mountain; for the earth would be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.' "

(To be Continued.)

A Summary View of the State of the Argument, on the Historical Evidences of Christianity, between Mr. Beard and his opponents Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor.

(Continued from page 166.)

Mr. C.—Another fact is, that the earliest record of Christianity in existence, is the letter by Pliny to Trajan.

Mr. B.—It is by no means certain that Tacitus did not write that portion of his history, which proves the existence of Christianity before the fall of Jerusalem, until the sixtieth year of his age. According to Gibbon, he was occupied in collecting materials for his work (the Annals) during the greater part of his life. Say he lived seventy years, and the greatest part of his life forty. At thirty, then, he began to collect his materials. We are, therefore, authorised to refer the testimony of Tacitus to a much earlier part of his life than his sixtieth year. It is the time when our historian decides on the reception of a certain document, that his testimony refers. Now Tacitus was born at the latest, in the year 61 or 62, A. D.; and it is allowed by Bayle, and confirmed by Lardner,

that Tacitus flourished in the first century. Every impartial judge will, then, I imagine, think that Lardner has placed the testimony of Tacitus sufficiently late, when he fixes it at 100, A. D. The evidence of Pliny is justly dated 106, A. D. consequently, that of Tacitus must be esteemed prior to it. But admitting the testimony of Pliny to be prior to that of Tacitus, still nothing would be conceded. On the contrary, we should gain the means of confuting our opponent's visionary conjecture, that Christianity first saw the light about the year 100, A. D. For the latest year to which Pliny's testimony can be referred, is 106; and he states that some had been Christians about twenty years. This, alas! brings us back fourteen years before the time that our theorist permits Christianity to see the light; fourteen years before our Grecian fabulist had fabricated *his* Christianity, this history, appealed to by Mr. Carlile, affirms Christians to have been in existence!—(L. i. p. 19–21.)

Mr. C.—Pliny, by his own confession, knew nothing of the Christians, before his coming into the Grecian cities of Asia Minor.

Mr. B.—This assertion you must substantiate, or your credit is lost. Here, then, follows Pliny's own account of the matter: your readers shall judge for themselves of the correctness of your assertion.

"Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, wisheth health and happiness. It is my constant custom, Sir, to refer myself to you in all matters concerning which I have any doubt: for who can better direct me when I hesitate, or instruct me when I am ignorant. I have never been present at any trials of *Christians;* so that I knew not well what is the subject matter of punishment, or of inquiry, or what strictness ought to be used in either. Nor have I been a little perplexed to determine whether any difference ought to be made on account of age, or whether the young and tender, and the full grown and the robust, ought to be treated all alike; whether repentance should entitle to pardon, or whether all who have once been Christians ought to be punished, though they are now no longer so; whether the name itself, although no crimes be detected, or crimes only belonging to the name, ought to be punished. Concerning all these things I am in doubt.

"In the mean time, I have taken this course with all who have been brought before me, and have been accused as Christians. I have put the question to them, whether they were Christians? Upon their confessing to me that they were, I repeated the question a second and a third time, threatening also to punish them with death. Such as still persisted, I ordered away to be punished; for it was no doubt with me, whatever might be the nature of their opinions, that contumacy and inflexible obstinacy ought

to be punished. There were others of the same infatuation, whom because they are Roman citizens, I have noted down to be sent to the city. In a short time, the crime spreading itself, even whilst under persecution, as is usual in such cases, divers sorts of people came in my way. An information was presented to me, without mentioning the author, containing the names of many persons, who, upon examination, denied that they were Christians, or had ever been so; who repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and, with wine and frankincense, made supplication to your image, which for that purpose I had caused to be brought and set before them, together with the statues of the deities. Moreover, they reviled the name of Christ. None of which things, as is said, they who are really Christians can by any means be compelled to do. These, therefore, I thought proper to discharge.

"Others were named by an informer, who at first confessed themselves Christians, and afterwards denied it. The rest said, they had been Christians, but had left them; some three years ago, some longer, and one or more, above *twenty years*. They all worshipped your image and the statues of the gods, they also reviled Christ. They affirmed, that the whole of their fault or error lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light, and sing among themselves alternately a hymn to Christ as a God, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things were performed, it was their custom to separate, and then come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder; but this they had forborne since the *publication of my edict*, by which, according *to your commands, I prohibited Assemblies*. After receiving this account, I judged it the more necessary to examine, and that by torture, two maid-servants, which were called ministers. But these discovered nothing, beside a bad and excessive superstition. Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice; for it has appeared unto me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially on account of *the great number of persons* who are in danger of suffering. For *many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country.* Nevertheless, it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain that the temples which were *almost forsaken*, begin to be more frequented; and the sacred solemnities, *after a long intermission*, are revived. Victims, likewise, are every where bought up, whereas for some time *there were few purchasers*, when, it is easy to imagine, what *numbers of men* might be reclaimed, if pardon were granted to those who shall repent!"

Now, Sir, point out the "*confession.*" Where does Pliny *confess* that he knew nothing of this sect before he came into his province? But lest I may be thought to

deprive you of the means of justification, I subjoin the reply of Trajan.

"Trajan to Pliny, wishes health and happiness. You have taken the right method, my Pliny, in your proceedings with those that have been brought before you as Christians, for it is impossible to establish any one rule that shall hold universally. They are not to be sought for. If any are brought before you, and are convicted, they ought to be punished. However, he that denies his being a Christian, and makes it evident in fact, that is, by supplicating to our gods, though he be suspected to have been so formerly, let him be pardoned upon repentance. But in no case, of any crime whatever, may a bill of information be received without being signed by him who presents it; for that would be a dangerous precedent, and unworthy of my government."

I again demand the "*confession.*" It is not, as far as I can perceive, to be found in these letters. The Christians are spoken of as persons whose characters were perfectly well known. Pliny designates Christians as certain persons whom he met with in his province. If the name had been new either to himself or the Emperor, he would have commenced his letter by describing them; he would have said, "Since arriving in these parts, I have met with a certain class of men whom they call Christians, a religious body, deriving their name, &c." On the contrary, he speaks of the name as one perfectly familiar to himself and the Emperor. This, besides the absence of all "confession," negatives your bold assertion, that "Pliny knew nothing, by his own confession, &c." There is good reason to believe, that Pliny wrote his letter to Trajan, soon after his arrival in his province. Before this he had issued an edict. It is not, therefore, unreasonable to infer, that he brought this edict with him, which we see by its effects regarded the Christians. Both he and the Emperor, then, were acquainted with the persons against whom they were legislating, before Pliny came into Bithynia.—(L. i. p. 22–25.)

Mr. C.—All the information that Pliny could get of them (the Christians) was, that they were A FEW SLAVES, &c.

Mr. B.—How could you write this, and not blush? Read, Sir, the clearest conviction of this falsehood, in the letter above quoted. "For *many* of all ages, of *every rank*, of both sexes, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion seized *cities only, but the lesser towns, and also the open country.*"—(L. i. p. 25, 26.)

Mr. C.—I had not read it (Pliny's letter) for near six years, when I made an observation from it on memory,

and recollecting that he tortured two slaves who ministered to the Christians, my impression was, that they were all slaves.

Mr. B.—Of course, we receive your account of the matter. Yet your readers must deplore the treachery of your memory. It is not long since they heard you boast of a perfect knowledge of, and competency for, this whole controversy: "I have been so long and laboriously engaged in this controversy, that I can anticipate every word that can be adduced by my opponents," &c. Your readers must equally regret that the imperfections of your memory have impaired your judgment also; and when they see that you can infer from the certainty of there being two slaves, that "all" were "slaves," and that all but a "few;" and deluded also by the same unfaithful monitor, write of a confession that is no where to be found, they will feelingly exclaim, "Oh! what a falling off is here my friends!" "How are the mighty fallen!"—(L. ii. p. 57, 58.)

(To be Concluded in our next.)

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

The misrepresentations of the sentiments held by Unitarians, which are to be found in works written expressly against us, though a cause of great pain and vexation, admit, at least to some extent, of remedy through the medium of the press; but those that are uttered in the pulpit, which are often more sweeping and bitter, because the preacher thinks himself sheltered from observation and stricture, are chiefly efficient in obstructing the progress of truth, and too often are suffered to pass, because they are not known, without merited castigation. If, however, publicity were given to them, preachers would be more guarded, and an approximation at least to fair dealing would be gained. Under these impressions, I send for admission to the Pioneer, the following Letters.

Yours, respectfully,

JOHN R. BEARD.

Manchester, Jan. 10, 1828.

To the Rev. Jabez Bunting, Methodist Preacher.

REV. SIR,

WHILST attending at the religious services in the Irwell-Street Chapel this day, when you officiated, I was pained to hear you utter, towards the close of your sermon, and when speaking of the dignity of human nature, the following words: "There is a set of men *characterised* by the *malignancy* of their opposition to the *Christian Revelation;* or, at least, to some of its fundamental doctrines, who *talk largely and loudly of the dignity* of human nature." These words are in agreement with calumnies that are not unfrequently launched against the Unitarians. On that account, I fear that you meant to designate that body by the words which I have cited. The object of this Letter, is to beg that you will satisfy me on this head. Did you, or did you not, intend to designate the Unitarians by the above words? if not, to whom did you refer? I shall wait till Saturday in expectation of your reply, and if I am not favoured with it within that period, shall be constrained to conclude that your silence is a proof that the Unitarians were intended.

I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient Servant,

JOHN RELLY BEARD.

December 25, 1827.

To the Rev. J. R. Beard.

SALFORD, Dec. 28, 1827.

REV. SIR,

IN replying to your Letter of the 25th inst. I shall not stay to remark on the somewhat too pugnacious and inquisitorial style which appears to me to characterise its contents; or to argue the question of your right as a stranger, to demand a personal explanation or defence of opinions uttered only in my own pulpit, and in a discourse professedly addressed, almost *extempore*, to my own proper flock and congregation. But I will frankly state, that in the sentence which you have, not *quite* accurately, quoted, I referred primarily and chiefly to a well-known class of *Infidels*, who often attack Christianity in no mild or measured terms, on the ground of what they understand, and, I think, correctly understand, to be one of

its fundamental doctrines. In opposition to these men, I affirmed, in the sentence which followed that which has offended you, that it is *the Christian system* which confers on the human nature its truest dignity, and exhibits it in its highest exaltation and excellence. It is, however, notorious, that there are persons who admit the divine origin of our holy religion, but who, nevertheless, agree with Infidels in those views of the present state of human nature to which I alluded; and that *some of these*, like the party with whom they on this point coalesce, are in the habit of attacking the opposite sentiment, in a spirit of bitterness and invective, such as betrays, in my judgment, that malignant hostility to the humbling truths of the Gospel, which I apprehend to be one of the most prevailing diseases of our fallen nature. Now, I grant that my observation did fairly include, and *probably*, though I have now no very distinct recollection of the precise feeling of the moment, was *intended* to include, persons of the latter description as well as the former.

I must take leave, in conclusion, to observe, that I have neither leisure nor inclination for *useless* controversy, or even for what I deem to be an *unnecessary* self-defence. Incessant public and pastoral duties compel me to say, like Nehemiah of old, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down: why should the work cease, whilst I leave it, and come down to you?" I have not adopted those views of the Christian system which I profess and teach, without careful examination, and conscientious conviction of their general accordance with the Scriptures of truth. And I, therefore, think myself quite at liberty to hold and to preach them to the people whom I serve as one of their ministers, without being amenable either privately or publicly, to the self-constituted tribunal of the pastors or members of another body. If any such be anxious for polemical discussion, they may, in my opinion, find ample occupation for their time and talents, in attempting to answer what I hold to be the *yet unanswered* arguments of many old and standard writers, who have publicly taken the field in defence of those doctrines which Socinians impugn.

With sentiments of personal good-will and respect,

I am, Rev. Sir, your obedient Servant,

JABEZ BUNTING.

To the Rev. Jabez Bunting.

REV. SIR,

I AM favoured with your reply to my Letter of the 25th December: I should not have again troubled you, had I not felt desirous of explaining my motives and intentions in the request that I made to you. I have again read my Letter, and confess myself incapable of discovering its "pugnacious and inquisitorial style." We are not, however, the best judges of our own productions, and if such a spirit is discernible in its language, I beg entirely to disclaim it. It is not my intention to inquire whether or not I have a right to that which I am not aware of having made any pretension to, namely, to "*demand*" an explanation; but I would submit, that it may not be unseemly to "*beg*" an explanation of language, which a *public teacher* made use of, in a *public* place of worship, and which appeared to me a gross misrepresentation of the sentiments entertained by the body of Christians, to whom I deem it an honour to belong. That, Sir, which you suggest as an apology for the language used, namely, that it was addressed to your own proper flock and congregation, was the chief reason with me for begging an explanation. In your own pulpit, your chief influence undoubtedly exists. Every representation you there make, remains unimpeached, and receives, perhaps, I may say, implicit belief. On these accounts, ministers should in their own pulpits use the greatest caution; but I lament to know, that the reverse is the fact, and in the pulpit it is, that the greatest misrepresentations of the Unitarian doctrine are uttered. These misrepresentations I believe to be one of the greatest impediments to the progress of what I deem Christian truth. I put it, then, to yourself, Sir, whether I ought not to feel myself bound to use every proper means, in order to exert a check upon such a license, and to diminish, as far as my influence extends, that which tends to bar in the minds of the public, every access to pure and undefiled religion? Would not you in similar circumstances, act in a similar manner? Would you grant to me an unimpeded license of uttering, in my pulpit, most erroneous representations of Methodism? Would you acquiesce in the answer, "It is my own *pulpit,* my own *congregation,* you are a *stranger!*" or would you deem the apology sufficient, that the obnoxious language was delivered "*extempore?*" You would be

ready to reply, "Think before you speak, and then you will not speak what you do not think. Say nothing to your congregation, that you would not say to the world, and then you need not deprecate the intrusiveness to strangers."

You totally misunderstood my intention, if you imagined that I wished to draw you into a discussion of the points at issue, between Unitarians and Trinitarians. I have no fondness to provoke controversy; and if I consulted my feelings merely, I should never engage in it. It is more congenial to my nature to apply the Christian principles to my moral wants, than to be employed in agitating questions. Yet I will never shrink from an open avowal and maintenance of the opinions which I have been led to regard as true; nay, on all proper occasions, must deem it a paramount duty, to impugn a system, which, it is my firm conviction, teaches for doctrines the commandments of men. As long as you confined yourself to argument in your sermon, though I dissented, I could not disapprove. You were performing what conscience dictated to be a duty, and were teaching according to your knowledge. But when you descended to use language, which, I am certain, is correctly cited in my Letter, in every important word, I had a right to feel aggrieved, and was bound by my profession to endeavour to exert a check. Your Letter satisfies me, that my fears were but too well founded, and, in my apprehension, contains a clear but *circuitous* admission, that Unitarians were characterised by you, as *malignant opposers of the Christian Revelation!* or, at least, of some of its fundamental doctrines. I lament the more, that you should have used such language, because many of your congregation, knowing, no doubt, that in early life, you had the best opportunities of correct information respecting Unitarians and their principles, would attach unhesitating credence to your words. I hope the day is not far distant, when language which includes in its sentence of proscription, some of the best and most enlightened men, and language which I regard as essentially opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, will no longer be heard. In the mean time, whoever makes use of it, lends his aid to perpetuate and increase a sectarian spirit, and checks the progress of truth and the prevalence of Christian amity. To hasten the day when there shall be *peace* on earth, and *good will* among men, has been my object in this correspondence; and with the same view,

I shall publish at least the substance of it, in one of our periodicals, a copy of which you shall be furnished with.

In conclusion, I beg to express my admiration and reverence of your devotement to the office of the Christian ministry; and praying, that, in this respect, I may be permitted, at least in some measure, to imitate your example,

I remain, Rev. Sir,
With sentiments of Christian benevolence,
Your obedient Servant,

January, 1828. JOHN R. BEARD.

Unitarian Worthies.—No. 3, *Thomas Emlyn.*

> ——————— If men have died
> Their hearths and shrines inviolate to keep,
> He was a mate for such.

The scenes which have lately been exhibited in Ireland, in connection with the Synod of Ulster, direct our attention to one of the excellent of the earth, who suffered in the same kingdom, for the cause of truth and righteousness. The Rev. Thomas Emlyn was descended from a substantial and reputable family, and born at Stamford in Lincolnshire, May 27, 1663. His parents though they frequented the Established Church, yet being favourable to the sentiments of the Non-conformists, chose to bring up their son to the ministry among them. With this view he studied at an Academy in Northamptonshire, and in Emanuel College, Cambridge. The principles in which he was educated, he sincerely embraced; and accordingly was led to think, that he was bound not to take his religion upon the credit of common vogue—the authority of Doctors or Synods, or the laws of the State. To search the Holy Scriptures, appeared to him the safest and the unerring guide of faith, worship, and practice. These just sentiments led him to the belief in the strict and proper unity of God, and to the endurance of persecution. An intimacy which he formed with Mr. William Manning, a worthy Non-conformist minister, conduced much to the correctness of his religious sentiments. But it was Dr. Sherlock's "Vindication of the Trinity," that was chiefly instrumental in convincing him, how far many were gone backward towards Polytheism. He long tried how far he could satisfy himself "with some Sabellian terms,

making out a Trinity of somewhats in one single mind: I found," he continues, "that by the Tri-theistical scheme of Dr. Sherlock and Mr. Howe, I best preserved a Trinity, but I lost the Unity: by the Sabellian schemes of modes, and substances, and properties, &c. I best kept up the Divine Unity, but then I had lost the Trinity, so that I could never keep both in view at once. Till I had, upon much serious thought and study of the Holy Scriptures, with many concerned addresses to the Father of lights, found great reason, first to doubt, and after, by degrees, to alter my judgment in relation to formerly received opinions of the Trinity and the supreme Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. For, though the Word of God was my rule, I could not tell how to understand that rule but by the use of my reason; knowing well that he who tells me I must lay aside my reason when I believe the Gospel, does plainly declare, that to believe is to act without reason, and that no rational man can be a Christian! I desired only to know what I must believe, and why? As to the latter, I was satisfied that divine revelation is a sufficient ground of belief; but then I must conceive what it is that it reveals, and that I am explicitly to believe and profess: for a faith of sounds without meaning, I understand not; and no more can believe any sounds than I can see them with my eyes. I could not understand that it should be necessary to say my prayers with understanding, and my creed without it; and could every whit as much edify by worship as by belief uttered in an unknown tongue. I did not make my reason the rule of my faith, but employed it to judge what was the meaning of that written Rule or Word of God, and thus was led to form notions different from what others had taught me, without regard either to Arians or Socinians,—not agreeing wholly with either."

It is not to our purpose, to trace the events of Mr. Emlyn's life in detail, prior to the persecution which he suffered. He was settled in Dublin, joint pastor with Mr. Boyse. Here he soon came into great reputation as a preacher. He had not only a portly presence, a strong clear voice, and a graceful delivery, but his discourses were rational, persuasive, serious, and pathetic. Few excelled him in prayer, and he was exemplary in the private duties of the pastoral office. Being possessed of an easy fortune, he lived in affluence; besides which, he was in a station of large and extensive influence, was highly

beloved by his people, and well-respected by all who knew him. In 1697, he had some thoughts of openly declaring his sentiments in relation to the Trinity, and of breaking off from the congregation; but on mature deliberation, he determined not to proceed abruptly in so important an affair, nor to throw himself out of a station of usefulness. At the same time, he was resolved to embrace the first fair occasion, of declaring his opinion concerning the Trinitarian doctrine.

The first occasion was given to his persecution, by Dr. Cummins, a member of his congregation. Having observed that Mr. Emlyn avoided expressing the common opinion, and those arguments which are supposed to support it, he strongly suspected that his judgment was against the supreme Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ. This suspicion he communicated to Mr. Boyse: the consequence of which was, that they waited upon Mr. Emlyn, acquainting him with their suspicions. Being thus applied to, he thought himself bound as a Christian, to declare openly his faith in so great a point. Accordingly, he freely owned himself to be convinced that the God and Father of Jesus Christ, is alone the supreme God. At the same time, Mr. Emlyn told the gentlemen, that he did not aim to make any strife among the people of the congregation, but was willing to leave them peaceably: that, if they pleased, they might choose another minister. This, however, was not to be permitted him. Mr. Boyse brought the matter before the Dublin ministers, though he knew well the narrowness of their principles, and that some of them had reflected upon his own orthodoxy. The ministers at their first meeting, agreed to cast him off, and that he should not be permitted to preach any more; and this they did without consulting his congregation, who, as yet, were entire strangers to the affair. Mr. Emlyn then directed the deacons and chief managers of the church to be called together, when he informed them that a difference of opinion relative to the Trinity, had rendered him offensive to some who were present, and to the ministers of Dublin; upon which account, thankfully acknowledging the kindness and respect they had shown him for so many years, he desired his dismissal. At this declaration, the gentlemen who were present, were greatly surprised and grieved, and Dr. Cummins himself then wished, that he had not began the business. The minis-

ters agreed, that Mr. Emlyn should retire to England, accompanying their agreement with an imperious message, charging him not to preach any where to whatsoever place he went. Mr. E. embarked for England the next day, with great inconvenience to himself and family; and no sooner was he gone, than a loud clamour was raised against him and his opinions. He now saw that he had entered upon a dark scene, and must prepare himself for various trials. He had not been of so unsocial a nature as not to relish the society and love of his dear friends, nor was he insensible to the pangs of a sudden and violent separation. Neither was he yet so mortified to the world, as not to feel the difference between contempt and respect, between affluence and straits. Nevertheless, his convictions of what he believed to be truth, were so clear, that these afflictions never staggered his resolution of adhering to it in the midst of all discouragements. When he came to London, he found some persons who were disposed to treat him with candour and charity. This, however, was so offensive to the Dublin ministers, that they endeavoured by their letters to render him as odious as possible. We cannot better express our sentiments of the conduct of these ministers, than in the language of Mr. E. himself. "If," he says, "the Presbyterians and Independents claim such a power as this, not only to reject from their own communion, but to depose from their office, such pastors of other churches who conscientiously differ from them in opinion, and to extend this to other kingdoms, forbidding them to preach there also, I think they have a mighty conceit of their own large dominion, and discover a very ridiculous ambition. I wonder who gave *them* this sovereign deposing power over their brethren, any more than the Pope his arrogated power of deposing other people's kings."

(To be Continued.)

"*Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, occasioned by the publication of Scott's Life of Napoleon.*"

THESE Remarks constituted a Review of the work of Sir Walter Scott, and appeared in that excellent and well-conducted publication, the Christian Examiner, printed at Boston, Massachusets. The Remarks have since been

re-published in a pamphlet, by Bowles & Dearborn of that town. To our minds, they are worthy of being published in all the languages of the world. They are eminently Christian remarks. They are the production of one of the master-spirits of these times. They embody those principles and feelings which alone can work the moral regeneration of mankind. Undazzled by ambition's triumphs, imperial splendour, the world's flatteries, or the world's commiseration, Dr. Channing looks on the deeds of Bonaparte, with the eye of a practical disciple of Jesus, weighing his actions in the balance of Christian rectitude, and expressing his opinions with the freedom becoming an advocate of Christian truth and righteousness. We are persuaded it will be an acceptable service to many of our readers, our giving extracts from this truly admirable work.

After a few observations on Sir Walter Scott's Life of Napoleon, Dr. Channing proceeds;—

"A just estimate of the late emperor of France seems to us important. That extraordinary man, having operated on the world with unprecedented power during his life, is now influencing it by his character. That character, we apprehend, is not viewed as it should be. The kind of admiration which it inspires, even in free countries, is a bad omen. The greatest crime against society, that of spoiling it of its rights and loading it with chains, still fails to move that deep abhorrence, which is its due; and which, if really felt, would fix on the usurper a brand of indelible infamy. Regarding freedom as the chief interest of human nature, as essential to its intellectual, moral, and religious progress, we look on men, who have signalized themselves by their hostility to it, with an indignation at once stern and sorrowful, which no glare of successful war, and no admiration of the crowd, can induce us to suppress. We mean, then, to speak freely of Napoleon. But if we know ourselves, we could on no account utter one unjust reproach. We speak the more freely, because conscious of exemption from every feeling like animosity. We war not with the dead. We would resist only what we deem the pernicious influence of the dead. We would devote ourselves to the cause of freedom and humanity, a cause perpetually betrayed by the admiration lavished on prosperous crime and all-grasping ambition. Our great topic will be the character of Napoleon; and with this we shall naturally intersperse reflections on the great interests which he perpetually influenced.

"We begin with observing, that it is an act of justice to Bonaparte to remember, that he grew up under disastrous influences, in a troubled day, when men's minds were convulsed, old institutions overthrown, old opinions shaken, old restraints snapped asunder; when the authority of religion was spurned, and youth abandoned to unwonted license; when the imagination was made

feverish by visions of indistinct good, and the passions swelled, by the sympathy of millions, to a resistless torrent. A more dangerous school for the character cannot well be conceived. That All-seeing Being, who knows the trials of his creatures and the secrets of the heart, can alone judge to what degree crimes are extenuated by circumstances so inauspicious. This we must remember in reviewing the history of men, who were exposed to trials unknown to ourselves. But because the turpitude of an evil agent is diminished by infelicities of education or condition, we must not, therefore, confound the immutable distinctions of right and wrong, and withhold our reprobation from atrocities which have spread misery and slavery far and wide.

"It is also due to Napoleon to observe, that there has always existed, and still exists, a mournful obtuseness of moral feeling, in regard to the crimes of military and political life. The wrong-doing of public men on a large scale, has never drawn upon them that sincere, hearty abhorrence which visits private vice. Nations have seemed to court aggression and bondage, by their stupid, insane admiration of successful tyrants. The wrongs, from which men have suffered most, in body and mind, are yet unpunished. True, Christianity has put into our lips censures on the aspiring and the usurping. But these reproaches are as yet little more than sounds, and unmeaning common-places. They are repeated for form's sake. When we read or hear them, we feel that they want depth and strength. They are not inward, solemn, burning convictions, breaking from the indignant soul with a tone of reality, before which guilt would cower. The true moral feeling in regard to the crimes of public men, is almost to be created. We believe, then, that such a character as Bonaparte's, is formed with very little consciousness of its turpitude; and society, which contributes so much to its growth, is responsible for its existence, and merits in part the misery which it spreads.

"Of the early influences, under which Bonaparte was formed, we know little. He was educated in a military school, and this, we apprehend, is not an institution to form much delicacy, or independence of moral feeling; for the young soldier is taught, as his first duty, to obey his superior without consulting his conscience; to take human life at another's bidding; to perform that deed, which above all others requires deliberate conviction, without a moment's inquiry as to its justice, and to place himself a passive instrument in hands, which, as all history teaches, often reek with blood causelessly shed.

"His first political association was with the Jacobins, the most sanguinary of all the factions which raged in France, and whose sway is emphatically called 'the reign of terror.' The service which secured his command in Italy, was the turning of his artillery on the people, who, however dangerous when acting as a mob, happened in the present case to understand their rights, and were directing their violence against manifest usurpation.

"His first campaign was in Italy, and we have still a vivid recollection of the almost rapturous admiration, with which we

followed his first triumphs; for then we were simple enough to regard him as the chosen guardian of liberty. His peculiar tactics were not then understood; the secret of his success had not reached us; and his rapid victories stimulated the imagination to invest him with the mysterious powers of a hero of romance. We confess that we cannot now read the history of his Italian wars without a quickened movement in the veins. The rapidity of his conceptions; the inexhaustibleness of his invention; the energy of his will; the decision which suffered not a moment's pause between the purpose and its execution; the presence of mind, which, amidst sudden reverses and on the brink of ruin, devised the means of safety and success; these commanding attributes, added to a courage, which, however suspected afterwards, never faltered then, compel us to bestow, what indeed we have no desire to withhold, the admiration which is due to superior power.

"Let not the friends of peace be offended. We have said, and we repeat it, that we have no desire to withhold our admiration from the energies which war often awakens. Great powers, even in their perversion, attest a glorious nature, and we may feel their grandeur, whilst we condemn, with our whole strength of moral feeling, the evil passions by which they are depraved. We are willing to grant that war, abhor it as we may, often developes and places in strong light, a force of intellect and purpose, which raises our conceptions of the human soul. There is perhaps no moment in life, in which the mind is brought into such intense action, in which the will is so strenuous, and in which irrepressible excitement is so tempered with self-possession, as in the hour of battle. Still the greatness of the warrior is poor and low, compared with the magnanimity of virtue. It vanishes before the greatness of principle. The martyr to humanity, to freedom, or religion; the unshrinking adherent of despised and deserted truth; who, alone, unsupported, and scorned, with no crowd to infuse into him courage, no variety of objects to draw his thoughts from himself, no opportunity of effort or resistance to rouse and nourish energy, still yields himself calmly, resolutely, with invincible philanthropy, to bear prolonged and exquisite suffering, which one retracting word might remove,—such a man is as superior to the warrior, as the tranquil and boundless heavens above us, to the low earth we tread beneath our feet.

"We have spoken of the energies of mind called forth by war. If we may be allowed a short digression, which, however, bears directly on our main subject, the merits of Napoleon, we would observe, that military talent, even of the highest order, is far from holding the first place among intellectual endowments. It is one of the lower forms of genius; for it is not conversant with the highest and richest objects of thought. We grant that a mind, which takes in a wide country at a glance, and understands almost by intuition the positions it affords for a successful campaign, is a comprehensive and vigorous one. The general, who disposes his forces so as to counteract a greater force; who supplies by skill, science, and genius, the want of numbers; who dives into

the counsels of his enemy, and who gives unity, energy, and success to a vast sphere of operations, in the midst of casualties and obstructions which no wisdom could foresee, manifests great power. But still the chief work of a general is to apply physical force; to remove physical obstructions; to avail himself of physical aids and advantages; to act on matter; to overcome rivers, ramparts, mountains, and human muscles; and these are not the highest objects of mind, nor do they demand intelligence of the highest order; and accordingly nothing is more common than to find men, eminent in this department, who are almost wholly wanting in the noblest energies of the soul; in imagination and taste, in the capacity of enjoying works of genius, in large views of human nature, in the moral sciences, in the application of analysis and generalization to the human mind and to society, and in original conceptions on the great subjects which have absorbed the most glorious understandings. The office of a great general does not differ widely from that of a great mechanician, whose business it is to frame new combinations of physical forces, to adapt them to new circumstances, and to remove new obstructions. Accordingly, great generals, away from the camp, are commonly no greater men than the mechanician taken from his workship. In conversation they are often dull. Works of profound thinking on general and great topics they cannot comprehend. The conqueror of Napoleon, the hero of Waterloo, undoubtedly possesses great military talents; but we have never heard of his eloquence in the senate, or of his sagacity in the cabinet; and we venture to say, that he will leave the world, without adding one new thought on the great themes, on which the genius of philosophy and legislature has meditated for ages. We will not go down for illustration to such men as Nelson, a man great on the deck, but debased by gross vices, and who never pretended to enlargement of intellect. To institute a comparison in point of talent and genius between such men and Milton, Bacon, and Shakspeare, is almost an insult on these illustrious names. Who can think of these truly great intelligences; of the range of their minds through heaven and earth; of their deep intuition into the soul; of their new and glowing combinations of thought; of the energy with which they grasped and subjected to their main purpose, the infinite materials of illustration which nature and life afford; who can think of the forms of transcendent beauty and grandeur which they created, or which were rather emanations of their own minds; of the calm wisdom and fervid impetuous imagination which they conjoined; of the dominion which they have exerted over so many generations, and which time only extends and makes sure; of the voice of power, in which, though dead, they still speak to nations, and awaken intellect, sensibility, and genius in both hemispheres; who can think of such men, and not feel the immense inferiority of the most gifted warrior, whose elements of thought are physical forces and physical obstructions, and whose employment is the combination of the lowest class of objects, on which a powerful mind can be employed?"

The author then slightly sketches the victories of the French General, in Italy and in Egypt; after which, he continues,

"The next great event in Bonaparte's history, was the usurpation of the supreme power of the state, and the establishment of military despotism over France. On the particulars of this criminal act we have no desire to enlarge, nor are we anxious to ascertain, whether our hero, on this occasion, lost his courage and self-possession, as he is reported to have done. We are more anxious to express our convictions of the turpitude of this outrage on liberty and justice. For this crime but one apology can be offered. Napoleon, it is said, seized the reins, when, had he let them slip, they would have fallen into other hands. He enslaved France at a moment, when, had he spared her, she would have found another tyrant. Admitting the truth of the plea, what is it but the reasoning of the highwayman, who robs and murders the traveller, because the booty was about to be seized by another hand, or because another dagger was ready to do the bloody deed? We are aware, that the indignation with which we regard this crime of Napoleon, will find a response in few breasts; for to the multitude, a throne is a temptation which no virtue can be expected to withstand. But moral truth is immoveable amidst the sophistry, ridicule, and abject reasonings of men; and the time will come, when it will find a meet voice to give it utterance. Of all crimes against society, usurpation is the blackest. He who lifts a parricidal hand against his country's rights and freedom—who plants his foot on the necks of thirty millions of his fellow-creatures—who concentrates in his single hand the powers of a mighty empire, and who wields its powers, squanders its treasures, and pours forth its blood like water, to make other nations slaves and the world his prey; this man, as he unites all crimes in his sanguinary career, so he should be set apart by the human race for their unmingled and unmeasured abhorrence, and should bear on his guilty head a mark as opprobrious as that which the first murderer wore. We cannot think with patience of one man fastening chains on a whole people, and subjecting millions to his single will—of whole regions overshadowed by the tyranny of a frail being like ourselves. In anguish of spirit we exclaim, How long will an abject world kiss the foot which tramples it? How long shall crime find shelter in its very aggravations and excess?

"Perhaps it may be said, that our indignation seems to light on Napoleon, not so much because he was a despot, as because he became a despot by usurpation—that we seem not to hate tyranny itself, so much as a particular mode of gaining it. We do, indeed, regard usurpation as a crime of peculiar blackness, especially when committed, as in the case of Napoleon, in the name of liberty. All despotism, however, whether usurped or hereditary, is our abhorrence. We regard it as the most grievous wrong and insult to the human race. But towards the hereditary despot we have more of compassion than indignation. Nursed and brought up in delusion, worshipped from his cradle, never spoken to in the

tone of fearless truth, taught to look on the great mass of his fellow-beings as an inferior race, and to regard despotism as a law of nature, and a necessary element of social life; such a prince, whose education and condition almost deny him the possibility of acquiring healthy moral feeling and manly virtue, must not be judged severely. Still, in absolving the despot from much of the guilt which seems at first to attach to his unlawful and abused power, we do not the less account despotism a wrong and a curse. The time for its fall, we trust, is coming. It cannot fall too soon. It has long enough wrung from the labourer his hard earnings; long enough squandered a nation's wealth on its parasites and minions; long enough warred against the freedom of the mind, and arrested the progress of truth. It has filled dungeons enough with the brave and good, and shed enough of the blood of patriots. Let its end come. It cannot come too soon."

Having, as First Consul, aimed at strengthening his power by calling men of all parties to his service, other means of attaining the same end are also pointed out:

"Another important and essential means of securing and building up his power, was the system of *espionage*, called the Police, which, under the Directory, had received a developement worthy of those friends of freedom, but which was destined to be perfected by the wisdom of Napoleon. It would seem as if despotism, profiting by the experience of ages, had put forth her whole skill and resources in forming the French police, and had forged a weapon, never to be surpassed, for stifling the faintest breathings of disaffection, and chaining every free thought. This system of *espionage* (we are proud that we have no English word for the infernal machine) had indeed been used under all tyrannies. But it wanted the craft of Fouche, and the energy of Bonaparte, to disclose all its powers. In the language of our author, 'it spread through all the ramifications of society;' that is, every man, of the least importance in the community, had the eye of a spy upon him. He was watched at home as well as abroad, in the boudoir and theatre, in the brothel and gaming-house; and these last named haunts furnished not a few ministers of the Argus-eyed police. There was an ear open through all France to catch the whispers of discontent—a power of evil, which aimed to rival, in omnipresence and invisibleness, the benignant agency of the Deity. Of all instruments of tyranny, this is the most detestable; for it chills the freedom and warmth of social intercourse—locks up the heart—infects and darkens men's minds with mutual jealousies and fears—and reduces to system a wary dissimulation, subversive of force and manliness of character. We find, however, some consolation, in learning that tyrants are the prey of distrust, as well as the people over whom they set this cruel guard; that tyrants cannot confide in their own spies, but must keep watch over the machinery which we have described, lest it recoil upon themselves. Bonaparte at the head of an army is a dazzling spectacle; but Bonaparte, heading a horde of spies, compelled to doubt and fear these base instruments of his power—compelled to

divide them into bands, and to receive daily reports from each, so that by balancing them against each other and sifting their testimony, he might gather the truth—Bonaparte, thus employed, is any thing but imposing. It requires no great elevation of thought to look down on such an occupation with scorn; and we see, in the anxiety and degradation which it involves, the beginning of that retribution which tyranny cannot escape.

"Another means by which the First Consul protected his power can excite no wonder. That he should fetter the press, should banish or imprison refractory editors, should subject the journals and more important works of literature to jealous superintendence, these were things of course. Free writing and despotism are such implacable foes, that we hardly think of blaming a tyrant for keeping no terms with the press. He cannot do it. He might as reasonably choose a volcano for the foundation of his throne. Necessity is laid upon him, unless he is in love with ruin, to check the bold and honest expression of thought. But the necessity is his own choice; and let infamy be that man's portion, who seizes a power which he cannot sustain, but by dooming the mind, through a vast empire, to slavery, and by turning the press, that great organ of truth, into an instrument of public delusion and debasement."

After sketching, in strong lines, the atrocities committed by Napoleon, to pave his way to uncontrolled dominion, the use he made of the Roman Catholic religion is ably narrated:

"Our religious prejudices have no influence on our judgment of this measure. We make no objections to it, as the restoration of a worship which on many accounts we condemn. We view it now simply as an instrument of policy, and in this light, it seems to us no proof of the sagacity of Bonaparte. It helps to confirm in us an impression, which other parts of his history give us, that he did not understand the peculiar character of his age, and the peculiar and original policy which it demanded. He always used common-place means of power, although the unprecedented times in which he lived, required a system, which should combine untried resources, and touch new springs of action. Because old governments had found a convenient prop in religion, Napoleon imagined that it was a necessary appendage and support of his sway, and resolved to restore it. But at this moment there were no foundations in France for a religious establishment, which could give strength and a character of sacredness to the supreme power. There was comparatively no faith, no devout feeling, and still more, no superstition to supply the place of these. The time for the re-action of the religious principle had not yet arrived; and a more likely means of retarding it could hardly have been devised, than the nursing care extended to the church by Bonaparte—the recent Mussulman—the known despiser of the ancient faith—who had no worship at heart but the worship of himself. Instead of bringing religion to the aid of the state, it was impossible that such a man should touch it, without loosening the faint

hold which it yet retained on the people. There were none so ignorant as to be the dupes of the First Consul in this particular. Every man, woman, and child, knew that he was playing the part of a juggler. Not one religious association could be formed with his character or government. It was a striking proof of the self-exaggerating vanity of Bonaparte, and of his ignorance of the higher principles of human nature, that he not only hoped to revive and turn to his account the old religion, but imagined, that he could, if necessary, have created a new one. 'Had the Pope never existed before, he should have been made for the occasion,' was the speech of this political charlatan; as if religious opinion and feelings were things to be manufactured by a consular decree. Ancient legislators, by adopting and sympathising with popular and rooted superstitions, were able to press them into the service of their institutions. They were wise enough to build on a pre-existing faith, and studiously to conform to it. Bonaparte, in a country of infidelity and atheism, and whilst unable to refrain from sarcasms on the system which he patronised, was weak enough to believe that he might make it a substantial support of his government. He undoubtedly congratulated himself on the terms, which he exacted from the Pope, and which had never been conceded to the most powerful monarchs; forgetting that his apparent success was the defeat of his plans; for, just as far as he severed the church from the supreme pontiff, and placed himself conspicuously at its head, he destroyed the only connection which could give it influence. Just so far its power over opinion and conscience ceased. It became a coarse instrument of state, contemned by the people, and serving only to demonstrate the aspiring views of its master. Accordingly, the French bishops in general refused to hold their dignities under this new head, preferred exile to the sacrifice of the rights of the church, and left behind them a hearty abhorrence of the Concordat, among the more zealous members of their communion. Happy would it have been for Napoleon, had he left the Pope and the church to themselves. By occasionally recognising and employing, and then insulting and degrading the Roman pontiff, he exasperated a large part of Christendom, fastened on himself the brand of impiety, and awakened a religious hatred which contributed its full measure to his fall."

(To be Continued.)

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *February* 1, 1828.

IN our First Volume, page 421, we had the pleasure of inserting the Protest against the Marriage Ceremony of England, which was presented by two of our friends in Lancashire. We also expressed our sincere hope, that

their union might be a happy one. Fleeting indeed has been its blessedness. We have now to record the death of Mr. Boardman. May the widow's God comfort the lonely mourner.

Died, Dec. 6, at his residence, Mountpleasant, near Manchester, Mr. Frederick Boardman, Solicitor. In his profession, he was remarkable for the conscientiousness with which he gave his opinions; and though opposed to his interest, yet he generally advised his clients to act upon the Scripture maxim, "agree with thine adversary quickly," as he felt it to be his duty to prevent them from needlessly incurring the expense and unpleasantness which too frequently attends litigation. In all his transactions he was characterised by an unbending regard to principle, and his memory is embalmed in the affectionate remembrance of those who knew his worth. It is, however, the chief object of this notice of the departed, to review some of the leading features of his religious character. He was, from personal investigation, a firm believer in the doctrines of Unitarianism; and during the latter period of his life, he cherished a hope that he should be able at a future period, to devote the whole of his time to the office of a Christian Teacher. During the greater part of the time that the Lancashire & Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society has been established, he was a preacher at its different stations. It was his practice generally to preach extempore, and there was always a fervour and an earnestness in his ministrations, which caused him to be listened to with great attention. He engaged in what he sincerely believed to be the cause of truth, with ardent and at the same time with steady zeal. The lukewarmness and want of co-operation which he observed in the general efforts of the Unitarians, to promote the cause of truth and holiness, was to him a subject of deep regret. Frequently has he remarked, that Unitarianism will never exert her whole energy, in reforming the mind and in subduing error, until its advocates are more sensibly convinced of its importance, and their hearts more seriously interested in its welfare. He greatly disliked that studious regard to fashion, and to the opinion of the world, which prevail too extensively even among that class of Unitarians which is considered as the most zealous and active. He often wished that the teachers of Unitarianism were more deeply imbued with the spirit of their Master, and that, like him, they would more faithfully and solemnly dedicate themselves to the great duties of their office. He was led into this train of feeling, from the anxious desire which he felt to extend the Gospel in its primitive simplicity, in order that its moral power might have a more extensive influence. It was also another source of regret to him, that he found so little religious conversation in Unitarian society. He thought, that much good would issue from the practice of devoting a greater part of the hours of social intercourse, to the consideration of religious subjects, instead of being wholly occupied by the discussion of politics or the merest gossip of the day. As a Christian, he felt that the more frequently the doctrines and the duties of Christianity were presented before the mind, the more likely it was that they would exert a beneficial influence over the conduct of its professors.

The Unitarian Society recently established in Salford, Manchester, has lost in him a valuable friend. He was connected with it from its infancy, and may be justly called one of its founders. He engaged with zeal and laboured with diligence, to promote the success of its different institutions, and he was greatly respected by its members for his talents and integrity. To the Sunday School he was a most efficient support; and, indeed, every scheme that had for its object the improvement of his fellow-creatures, found in him a ready and a sincere friend.

He was naturally formed for domestic life, and many are the sacrifices of ease and of enjoyment which he has made, to fulfil his duty. About seven months since (how brief a space!) he was married, when he entered his solemn protest against the marriage service, because it required from him an implied assent to the truth of doctrines which he believed to be fundamentally erroneous. How mysterious are the ways of Providence, that one who was just entering life, and whose energies were devoted to the service of his brethren, should be cut off in the bloom of existence! But it is a pleasing though melancholy reflection, to call to mind how well he was prepared for the awful event. No one knew better than he did, how dangerous, and, indeed, how hopeless is the condition of those who put off the great business of preparing for eternity, to the hour of decay and sickness. Frequently had he expressed with what a tranquil pleasure he looked forward to futurity. He contemplated the last solemn change to which humanity is subject, without the least feeling of terror or alarm. He put his trust in the mercy of God, and in it he felt the most unbounded confidence. Thus did he prove the efficacy and sufficiency of his faith. His last moments were marked with peace and serenity, and like the last departing rays of an evening sun, the vital spark fled from its tenement of clay.

We, from the first, expressed our conviction, that the proceedings of the Synod of Ulster would ultimately be productive of good. Had the unjust and unchristian proposition, with regard to Mr. Porter, only issued in binding together in friendly feeling, the Protestant inhabitants of the town, which is the scene of Mr. Porter's ministerial labours, it would have produced public benefit. Its influence, however, will extend much farther. We rejoice that the Congregations in that place, have vindicated themselves from the imputation of joining in the work of intolerance; and have, at no little cost, shown themselves to be sincere professors of the great Protestant principles of the sufficiency of the Scriptures, and the right of individual judgment. The Meeting in the Town Hall, Newtownlimavady, on the 18th December, for the purpose of presenting a Service of Plate to the calumniated and persecuted Clerk of the Synod, was not more heart-cheering to Mr. Porter, than it was honourable to the parties who contributed to the splendid and liberal gift. Dr. Moore, on the part of the Protestant inhabitants, read the following address:

"TO THE REV. WILLIAM PORTER,

"Rev. and Dear Sir,—We, members of the different Protestant Congregations in the town and neighbourhood of Newtownlimavady, request your acceptance of a Service of Plate, as a mark of our sincere regard and esteem. We feel great pleasure in declaring, that we recognise in you the exercise of those Christian virtues, without which, profession is but a name. We recognise in you, Sir, an indulgent parent, an affectionate husband, a kind master, and a sincere friend; with a morality unspotted, a candour and adherence to truth unsurpassed.

"Though some of us may entertain sentiments different from yours on certain doctrines, about which the wisest and best men have not been able to agree, yet we all perfectly concur, in expressing our warm approbation of the impressive manner in which you have uniformly inculcated, both by precept and example, the practical duties of Christianity, and of your strenuous advocacy, and manly exercise of the right of private judgment in the formation of religious opinions.

"We feel ourselves called on to express our disapprobation of the attempt made at the last meeting of Synod, to deprive you of the Clerkship of that body, merely because you had the candour to avow, and the consistency to adhere to theological opinions which you believed to be right. We, however, rejoice, that that attempt was defeated by the good sense and good feeling of the body.

"Whilst we admire and applaud that elevated spirit and unbending integrity, which, in opposition to the seductive suggestions of worldly wisdom, prompted your conduct on that occasion, we marvel that in the present enlightened age and country, such conduct should have incurred the censure of some of your brethren in the ministry. We cannot help lamenting, that teachers of the Gospel should have departed so widely from its forbearing and charitable spirit, and that men, calling themselves Presbyterians, should have evinced so little regard for what we deem the fundamental principles of their church, namely, *the right of private judgment, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as a rule of faith.*

"With the most ardent wishes for your happiness here, and your acceptance hereafter, through the blessed Redeemer, we take the liberty of subscribing ourselves your affectionate friends."

To the above Address, Mr. Porter replied:

"Mr. Chairman,—I do assure you, and my other friends, that with very few persons, indeed, would I at this moment exchange my feelings. During the course of last summer, there was a time, I confess, when my spirit was nearly subdued, and when I thought I should be borne down by obloquy, merely for having expressed opinions, which, however erroneous they may be deemed, can have emanated from no other source than conscientious conviction. But that time is past. I have found that there are liberal-minded men of every church, and of every creed, who will not allow an individual, whose intentions are upright, to be run down by vulgar clamour. The approbation of the persons whose names are subscribed to that address, more than compensates for all the injurious imputations to which I have been subjected; they are persons whose social, moral, and intellectual respectability, cannot be called in question. *These* articles are not begrimed, as such things have sometimes been, by the filthiness of the hands which present them. It affords me additional gratification, to reflect that this mark of your regard has not been earned by subserviency to popular prejudices, or by fomenting sectarian and political animosities. By ministering to the dissemination of jealousy, hatred, and all uncharitableness, it is easy for any one to obtain applause from the misjudging multitude; but the approbation of the wise and worthy cannot thus be conciliated. That right of private judgment, which you are pleased to give me credit for vindicating and exercising, I do most willingly allow to all my fellow-Christians. Though perfectly conscious that the commendation of my conduct as a man, a minister, and a member of Synod, is much exaggerated; yet I do not hesitate to acknowledge, that this very exaggeration is gratifying to my feelings; for it is kindness which has biassed your judgment.

"The pecuniary value of these things, considerable as it is, constitutes only a small portion of their worth: neither silver nor gold did I expect to bequeath to my children, but these memorials of your esteem and friendship, it shall be my study to transmit to them unsullied, and I

trust they will duly appreciate the legacy. To you, Mr. Chairman, and my other friends, I return heartfelt thinks. Most sincerely do I wish, that it may be well with you now, and eternally well with you hereafter."

On the Tea-pot and Coffee-Urn, is the following inscription, beautifully engraven:—"Presented to the Rev. WILLIAM PORTER, by his Protestant Friends, of different denominations, in Newtownlimavady and its vicinity, as a mark of their high esteem for his many amiable qualities in private life; and their cordial approbation of his fearless and disinterested assertion of the invaluable RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT. —1827."

ON Sunday and Monday, December the 30th and 31st, 1827, was held the Third Anniversary of the opening of the Unitarian Meeting-house, Green-Gate, Salford, Manchester. The religious services, on the occasion, were conducted by the Revs. W. Shepherd, J. G. Robberds, J. Grundy, and J. Brettell. The Society feel deeply indebted to all these gentlemen, for their valuable services; nor are they without hope, that Mr. Robberds may be induced to give to the public, the very excellent sermon on the popular doctrine of the two natures in Christ, with which he favoured them. On the Monday, a large and respectable company of members and friends of the Society, assembled together to dine in the School-room of the Meeting-house, when the Rev. W. Shepherd presided. The singular and splendid abilities of the Chairman, supported by other gentlemen of great talents and piety, afforded to the meeting the highest gratification. And we are sure, that we utter the sentiments of at least the majority of those who were present, when we assert, that it was almost impossible for any individual to leave the room without feeling that the best powers of his nature had been called into exercise—his dearest principles corroborated, and his desire for the extension of truth and goodness enhanced. It was delightful as well as edifying, to witness the flow of kind and brotherly feeling that prevailed, and the truly Christian advocacy of the most liberal and philanthropic sentiments.

Though the Society have made great exertions during the last year, to liberate themselves from their incumbrances, we are sorry to know that they are still shackled with a considerable debt. We respectfully invite for them the aid of our more opulent congregations in particular, as well as of the Unitarian public at large.

Glasgow Unitarian Chapel.

THE Unitarian Society in this City, was originally founded by the zealous and indefatigable exertions of a few individuals, excited to this labour by the late Dr. Spencer of Bristol, then a student of medicine at Edinburgh. In its infant state, it was aided by the exertions of the Rev. James Lyons and the Rev. Richard Wright, Missionaries from the London Unitarian Fund. Increasing in numbers, the Society invited the Rev. James Yates to become their Pastor; and soon after his settlement amongst them, they were induced to erect the first Chapel in Scotland sacred to the Worship of the One living and true God, the Father. Perceiving the importance of the principles they had embraced, to the promotion of human happiness, and their all-powerful efficacy in leading to the practice of virtue, they were sanguine enough to anticipate, that those principles had only to be publicly and powerfully advocated, and their progress was secured. They, therefore, issued proposals for building a Chapel in Glasgow, and the objects intended to be accomplished by the permanent establishment of a Unitarian Congregation in this city, were these:—"1st, That every aid and encouragement will

be given to Free Inquiry on religious subjects; 2d, That prayer and adoration will be addressed in the name of Jesus Christ, solely to the One true God; 3d, That repentance and reformation of manners, piety to God, benevolence to man, and a strict abstinence from every sinful passion and indulgence, will be enforced, as the only means of obtaining happiness in this life, and in that which is to come. The supreme importance of these principles, will, it is hoped, incline all who perceive their close connection with the welfare of individuals, and the general improvement of society, to support, according to their ability, a House of Prayer, in which they may worship the Father in spirit and in truth; in which pure and elevated devotion may spring from their knowledge and contemplation of the character of their Maker, in all its majesty and loveliness; where they may meet with kind and friendly assistance, in the calm, dispassionate, and unbiassed investigation of sacred truth; and where they may be incited to do honour to their Christian profession, and to accomplish the great ends of their being, by growing perpetually in conformity to the image of their Saviour, and in fitness for the presence of their God."

So confident were its projectors of meeting with public support, that they proposed to raise the sum necessary to complete the buildings, by subscriptions, the principal and interest to be duly paid back to the subscribers. Some donations, from members of the Congregation, and from friends both in Scotland and England, were, however, at the same time, kindly and generously offered. Still a considerable deficiency remained: the amount of which was advanced, on interest, by a respected individual of the Unitarian denomination in Lancashire. The Society, however, had relied too confidently on the immediate success of their principles. They had not sufficiently remembered, that the country in which they lived, was one, in which the doctrines of Calvinism had taken deep root—in which they were associated with the memory of revered ancestors, and the most glorious of patriotic struggles—in which they were endeared by the recollections of infancy, and confirmed by the power of education, and of habit. They had not taken sufficiently into account either, that utter indifference and scorn of all religion, which the re-action of reason and human nature, against the popular doctrines, had produced on a large and influential class. Where they looked for aid, they met with repulsion,—those who might privately applaud, withdrew their applause when so public an effort was determined on, and a host of prejudices were banded against the progress and prosperity of the Congregation.

The cost of the Chapel, Cellar, &c. was £2300. It may easily be conceived, that to so small a Society, the mere interest on the sum subscribed and borrowed, amounting, as it has already, to upwards of £800, together with the ground-rent and insurance, being near £30 additional, per annum, with the unavoidable expenses attending Public Worship, must have pressed heavily on its members. Indeed, so great has been the burthen, that although sometimes elated with hope, and never doubting the ultimate success of their principles, yet they saw so little prospect of liquidating the debt, that, but a few years since, the sale of the Chapel was taken into consideration, under the view, that could the sale be advantageously effected, the debt would be paid, and a considerable surplus remain towards the erection of a smaller place of worship. The Congregation at that time in want of a Chapel, have since built one for themselves.

In addition to the difficulties already enumerated, the Congregation think it right to state, that for so small a Society, the removals and emigrations, to say nothing of the decease of many of their zealous and leading friends, have been very considerable, sufficient, indeed, had they continued, to have constituted a large and respectable Society. The

friends of truth and righteousness, must not therefore imagine, that little has been effected, because the remaining members may be comparatively few. The doctrines of pure and undefiled Christianity, have, they trust, through their instrumentality, been disseminated far and wide, though their particular Society has not been the gainer. The labours of their former Ministers, have, they know, been effectual in enlightening many minds, and improving many hearts, that are now enjoying in other places, and other climes, the benefit they derived from their instructions. Notwithstanding the obstacles which have been mentioned, the Congregation, partly by the relinquishment of subscriptions from themselves and friends, and partly by donations from England, for which they gladly embrace this opportunity to return their grateful acknowledgments, have succeeded in paying off £802, and in reducing the original debt to £1498.

The Congregation, taking into consideration the immense population of this city, amounting to upwards of 170,000—its vast importance as a seat of learning, the constant resort of the young from all portions of Great Britain and Ireland, through whose means their principles, if their attention could be drawn to scriptural inquiry, might be extensively disseminated—its celebrity as one of the chief marts of commerce, bringing together persons from all quarters of the world, and by whom, it might be hoped, fresh channels of diffusing religious knowledge would be opened up,—were induced, in 1825, to make another and yet more vigorous effort, towards the advancement of the cause of Unitarian Christianity in Glasgow, and from thence through Scotland. During the two years their present Pastor has resided with them, the prospects of the Society have gradually brightened. The prejudice existing against the doctrines professed by the Congregation, has evidently declined; a spirit of inquiry has been called forth; an eagerness to read the works on Unitarian principles has been manifested, shown by the constant application for books, which are lent out, free of expense, at the close of each evening worship; and a desire to hear the Lectures on the Sabbath evenings has been evinced, which is highly cheering and satisfactory. Additional Sittings and Forms, capable of accommodating upwards of two hundred persons, have been placed in the Chapel, but these are found insufficient to accommodate the numbers which generally assemble in the evening. The effect of these exertions is witnessed, also, in the gradual and steady increase of the Congregation, and the attendance during the morning and afternoon worship. The Sittings at present taken, are treble those let three years ago; and the Collections at the door, have increased in about a similar proportion. The morning attendance averages about two hundred persons; the afternoon, between three and four hundred; and in the evening, the Chapel is crowded, and would be so, were it even much larger—numbers frequently being obliged to go away for want of room even to stand, the aisles and vestries being also filled,—tending to confirm the impression of its members, that a large and permanent Congregation will at length be established.

The Debt on the Chapel is still, however, a weight which oppresses and checks the efforts of the Society, to extend still further their exertions; and should the premises beneath the Chapel, from the rent of which, the interest of a portion of the Debt is in part paid, remain unoccupied for any length of time, or should considerable repairs be needed, as will most certainly ere long be the case, the consequences to the Congregation in particular, and to the progress of Unitarianism in Scotland generally, might be very serious. Impressed with these united considerations, but unwilling again to ask the aid of their brethren, until they had themselves done what they could, and conceiving that their better prospects authorise them now to make fresh exertions, the Congregation have resolved to make another attempt (may it prove a final because successful one) to liquidate the Debt on their House of Prayer. They

have already raised among themselves, £238, which they hope still further to increase. Having thus placed their own shoulders to the wheel, they respectfully, but urgently call upon all friends to the spread of liberality and benevolence, of unshackled conscience, and of Christian truth and virtue, to lend a helping hand. It is thus they will contribute to place the Congregation of Glasgow on a firm and respectable basis, aid the progress of religious reformation in Scotland, and promote the improvement, moral welfare, and everlasting happiness of their fellow-creatures.

The Unitarian Congregation of Glasgow, respectfully request the following Individuals to receive Donations on their account. The Donations will from time to time be advertised on the covers of the Monthly Repository and Christian Pioneer; and the smallest sum will be gratefully received and acknowledged.

Rev. T. Belsham, London.
Rev. T. Madge, London.
Rev. R. Aspland, Hackney.
Rev. W. J. Fox, Dalston.
Rev. Dr. Rees, Kennington.
Rev. J. S. Porter, London.
Rev. B. Mardon, London.
Joseph Fernie, Esq. London.
Mr. Hunter, Bookseller, London.
Mr. T. R. Horwood, British and Foreign Unitarian Association Office, Walbrook Buildings, London.
Rev. J. Kentish, Birmingham,
Rev. H. Hutton, Birmingham.
J. S. S. Spyring, Esq. Brighton.
Rev. Dr. Carpenter, Bristol.
Rev. H. Acton, Exeter.
Rev. J. Grundy, Liverpool.
Rev. T. Holland, Loughborough
Mr. Robert Cooper, Maidstone.
Rev. J. G. Robberds, Manchester.
Rev. J. J. Tayler, Manchester.
Rev. J. R. Beard, Manchester.
Rev. W. J. Bakewell, Norwich.
Rev. J. Tayler, Nottingham.
Rev. R. Scott, Portsmouth.
Rev. J. O. Squier, Saffron Walden.
Rev. Dr. Philipps, Sheffield.
Rev. R. Awbrey, Swansea.
Rev. J. Kenrick, York.

STATEMENT OF UNITARIAN CHAPEL, GLASGOW.

Original Cost of Chapel, Cellar, &c.	£2300	0	0
Debt already liquidated,	802	0	0
Balance of Debt against the Congregation,	£1498	0	0

Donations by Glasgow Congregation in 1828, £238 5 6

In the morning of Sunday, January 6, the Rev. W. J. Bakewell preached his farewell sermon to the Unitarian Congregation in Edinburgh; and in the afternoon of the same day, the Rev. I. Perry, formerly, we believe, a Calvinist Minister at Norwich, delivered his introductory discourse as his successor.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 19. MARCH, 1828. Vol. II.

A Summary View of the State of the Argument, on the Historical Evidences of Christianity, between Mr. Beard and his opponents Mr. Carlile and Mr. Taylor.

(Concluded from page 193.)

Mr. C.—It seems to me, that Pliny's letter contains the fact that Christianity began in or about Bithynia.

Mr. B.—If the fact is contained in the letter, point to the part where it is said that Christianity began in Bithynia: if it is said, nothing is easier than a reference. —(L. ii. p. 58.)

Mr. C.—No, this is quibbling; by fact, I mean probability; and by contained, suggests.

Mr. B.—Suggests the probability, then, is what you mean. Let us then weigh this probability. Whence does it arise? Consider the tenor of the letter; recall to mind what you have not answered relating to this matter, that the very circumstance, as I argued, of Pliny's not explaining the designation which he uses,—"Christians"—proves that the Emperor knew of them, and is a presumption that they then existed at Rome. Join to this presumption, the positive assertions of Suetonius and Tacitus, and no one can doubt of the fact, that Christians did exist at Rome not only at the time of Trajan, but long before.—(L. ii. p. 58.)

Mr. C.—Pliny found Christianity only precisely where I say it began.

Mr. B.—He found it there, and therefore he found it no where else! The sun shines in England, and therefore it shines no where else! This is of a piece with the famous old syllogism: Every man is an animal; every goose is an animal; therefore, every man is a goose.—(L. ii. p. 59.)

But the simple question between us, is, whether or not it is credible, that supposing as you do, that Christianity arose in the year 100, within the space of six years (Pliny's letter), it should, through the advocacy of illiterate men, have pervaded towns, villages, and the open country, caused a long intermission of the sacred rites, and made

votaries, some fourteen years before it arose. Run not from the point at issue. Meet this difficulty by fair arguments; show a parallel case.—(L. ii. p. 46.)

Mr. C.—A superstition plausible, might have made progress in one year.

Mr. B.—"Might have made:" can you prove that such a superstition as Christianity, propagated under similar circumstances, ever *has* made? Where are your facts, your references? Produce a parallel case with Christianity, and I will yield; but not till then.—(L. ii. p. 46.)

Mr. C.—As instances, I refer to the superstitions of Joanna Southcote and Mahomet.

Mr. B.—You have not corroborated your assertions by proofs; they are not parallel cases; for, in the first, it is notorious, that there was only addition to, not a subversion of, preconceived notions; and in the second, the founder himself had recourse to arms for the propagation of his creed. Then as to your "might have made progress in one year," the insignificant number of converts made by the strenuous and long-continued exertions of Christian missionaries in India, invalidates your supposition. Read the book published by the Abbé Dubois, on his return to England, after a mission of thirty years in India, and you will find him so dissatisfied with the progress there made by a "plausible superstition", during *centuries*, as to pronounce the conversion of the Hindoos a moral impossibility.—(L. ii. p. 46, 47.)

Mr. C.—The close similarity between the fable of Jesus and that of Prometheus, is another proof that the former contains no literal truth.

Mr. B.—Lempriere says, "Prometheus surpassed all mankind in cunning and fraud. He ridiculed the gods, and deceived Jupiter himself. To punish him, he ordered Mercury and Vulcan to carry this artful mortal to Mount Caucasus, and there tie him to a rock, where, for thirty thousand years, a vulture was to feed upon his liver." If there be close similarity between this fable and the history of Jesus, then there may be similarity between Atheism and Christianity, Virtue and Vice, and whatever else is most opposed.—(L. i. p. 26.)

Mr. C.—Prometheus made the first man and woman out of clay; so also did Jesus Christ.

Mr. B.—And this—this alone, to establish a *close* similarity! But this is not all; this one instance of alleged

similarity, has to be opposed to three instances of manifest dissimilarity. Three witnesses confront one; which is right? But I deny that the one instance of similarity which you have alleged, really exists. Supposing, however, that it does, the origin of the two fables is different. Prometheus is said to have formed men from clay, because he invented the art of modelling clay into representations of the human form. Nothing of this kind is said of Jesus Christ. This story of Prometheus, is merely a poetical version of a natural occurrence.* The story is also dissimilar in the circumstances, as well as in its origin. You only pretend that Jesus was the joint creator of Adam and Eve. But it is not on record, that Prometheus had any co-partner in his undertaking, or that those whom he had made, were called Adam and Eve. Prometheus made both man and woman from clay; but, in Genesis, we read that the woman was not made from clay at all. But, secondly, Apollodorus, who mentions the creative power of Prometheus, flourished long after the Hebrew Scriptures being translated into Greek were easily accessible to the Heathens, and may have taken his fable from the book of Genesis.—(L. ii. p. 50.)

Mr. C.—The tales of the two persons have one common foundation; Jesus is the Christian logos, or Word of God, Prometheus was the Grecian logos, or Word of God.

Mr. B.—Nor this, Sir, can you establish on adequate evidence. Prometheus is not the Grecian logos, or Word of God. According to the best authorities, it is composed of two words meaning *before* and *care*, and is pretty nearly equivalent to our adjective provident; nearly I say, for it is used in two acceptations, denoting either a person possessed of skill, or a person possessed of cunning.

The following is an analysis of the tragedy of Æschylus, and I leave your readers to judge for themselves, betwixt us, in this matter: they will see how far it is "a prototype of the Christian religion."

"Prometheus, as he had opposed Jupiter in his wishes to destroy the human race, and had conferred many benefits on miserable mortals, among which this is the chief, that he stole fire from Heaven and divided it amongst them, is committed by the enraged god to Vulcan and the deities who are called 'Might and Power.' These are commanded to bind him with chains to a certain rock in Scythia.

* Schutz's first excursion to his Æschylus.

" On the stage then appears Prometheus a captive, guarded by Vulcan, who carries bars and bolts, and also by Might and Strength, his cruel and unfeeling torturers. They urge Vulcan, who on account of his affinity to Prometheus feels pity for him, and therefore hesitates and is disposed to decline his cruel office; and threaten him with the vengeance of Jupiter unless he discharges his duty. Vulcan thus compelled, affixes Prometheus to a rough and precipitous rock. He neither exclaims nor groans at the presence of his torturers, but represses every expression of the anguish he feels, nor does he break silence or lament until they have left him. Soon, however, he regains his fortitude, and consoles his troubled mind by reasoning on fate and reflecting on his own immortality. Whilst thus occupied, the nymphs called the Oceanidæ present themselves before him, aroused by the clang of the chains with which Vulcan had bound Prometheus, and brought to him through the air in a winged chariot. After these nymphs had expressed their condolence with Prometheus in his misfortune, and intimated their solicitude respecting his future lot, as well as their desire to know the cause of his punishment, Prometheus relates to them the greatness of the obligation under which Jupiter lies to him, that he had brought on himself his anger and punishment, on account of benefits which he had conferred on man. In the mean time, the god Oceanus also arrives in order to see Prometheus, carried on a winged quadruped, which is interpreted to be a griffin. He deplores the pitiable fate of his relative, and endeavours to divest him of his pertinacity, as well as to induce him to check the ferocity of his mind and submit himself to Jupiter. He moreover promises to plead his cause with Jupiter. But Prometheus is so far from yielding to the importunities of his friend, that he dissuades him from the journey to Jupiter, which Oceanus had offered to undertake, and declares his resolution to be, to endure the vengeance of the king of gods until of himself he should remit it. Oceanus therefore, seeing him so determined, departs without accomplishing his purpose. The Chorus then proceeds to bewail the sad lot of Prometheus, and listens to him when afterwards he details the benefits which he had conferred on man; advises him to consult for his future safety, and professes its hopes of his future liberation. Prometheus replies, and lets fall certain obscure words, respecting a fated appointment, which even Jupiter himself could not avoid. The Chorus seeks an explanation, which he refuses, intimating that his safety was involved in his silence.

" The Chorus then takes an occasion to declare its high reverence of the majesty of Jupiter, to warn Prometheus, and to give him some friendly rebukes on account of the excessive ferocity of his mind. Then Io enters on the stage, who, tortured by the sting of love through the cruel anger of Juno, and a wanderer on the face of the earth, arrives on this part of Scythia. Prometheus makes himself known to her. She seeks to learn the causes of his punishment, and the termination of her own wanderings. In both respects he gratifies her; but first obtains his request of her to relate to the Chorus of Nymphs, the causes of her lamentable

exile and altered form. The Chorus weeps at the narration. Then Prometheus declares to Io, the labours and dangers which yet await her, and how that, having at last been brought to Egypt, Jupiter should restore her to happiness and her wonted appearance. As soon as he has procured credit to his words, he narrates to Io a part of the journey already completed, as well as other things which befel her in her journey hither. Then Io, being convulsed with a new access of madness, departs. The Chorus however praises equal matches, and discommends the love of the heavenly potentates. Prometheus, who had already predicted to Io that he was to be liberated by a hero descended from her, proceeds after her departure to utter ominous words against Jupiter, and declares that certain nuptials will prove fatal to him; if he contracted these nuptials (he says) he would be dispossessed of his heavenly throne by a son born from this union. Mercury, therefore, is sent by Jupiter to him, who commands Prometheus to declare what these nuptials are. Prometheus, however, so far from diminishing his pertinacity, vociferates more daringly, and acts not as a captive addressing the ambassador of Jupiter, but as a freeman conversing with a slave. Mercury, when he sees that he can effect nothing by words, denounces against him the horrible vengeance and pains of Jupiter, and admonishes the Chorus to depart, lest it should participate in the dreadful punishment about to be inflicted on Prometheus. The Chorus refuses to desert their friend in the moment of danger. And now suddenly lightnings and thunder arise, the sea heaves with storms, the earth trembles in violent commotion, and Prometheus, not conquered even by these horrors, is cast headlong into Tartarus with the rock to which he is affixed."

This, then, is the alleged prototype of the Christian religion. I do not know how the abstract may strike my readers, but it does seem to me, that, so far from presenting a resemblance to Jesus Christ, it exhibits no very imperfect picture of a being termed the devil, as portrayed in the pages of Milton.

The fact is, that no less than a score of historical personages, are held, by various authors, to have borne a close affinity with the fabled Prometheus. He is like the cameleon, assuming all colours, varying with the light in which men choose to regard him, under the influence of their perverted vision; or, as his ancient friend and fabulous deity Proteus, changing his form at the motion of the wand of any magician, who may wish to exhibit him for a while to amuse an astonished audience.—(L. ii. p. 50–53).

In the present controversy, you have made the following concessions, either by your silence, or your confession:

The word Joseph you took to be a variation of the word Jesus. This I denied, and you say, "this I have no objection to yield!" You asserted that it was said, that all the disciples of Jesus were

Jews. I asked for your authority—and to this, no reply. I proved that though even the names of the disciples were Grecian, it would not follow, that the disciples themselves were Grecian—to this, no reply. I went on to prove, that though even the disciples themselves were Grecian, neither would it follow that the story they propagated was Grecian—to this, no reply. I questioned if you knew the language of Jesus and his disciples, though you made the most positive assertion respecting it—to this, a confession of ignorance. I proved that the very Greek of the New Testament evinced that the book must have been for the most part written in Judea, prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. I challenged you to the disproof of this—and to this, no reply. You asserted, that "from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem to the predominance of the Christian religion, under the Roman Emperors, we have no history of Jerusalem." This I disproved—and to this, no reply. You ascribe the fabrication of Christianity to some Grecian fabulist. I asked for his name, his motives, his residence—and to this, no reply. You said he could make converts, because nobody could contradict him. This was exploded—and to this, no reply. I argued, that your fabulist could most easily have been convicted—and to this, no reply. You assimilated the Christianity of Origen to your own. This you were challenged to establish—and to this, no reply. I proved from Pliny's letter, that Christianity and Christians must have existed several years before you permitted them to see the light—and to this, no reply. I inquired how Tacitus could be guilty of so great an anachronism, as to speak of Christians in Rome fifty or sixty years before, according to you, they actually existed—and to this, no reply. You affirmed that public records were very rare at the time when Tacitus wrote. The contrary was established by historical proofs—and to this, no reply. I exhibited in your observations a specimen of a syllogism not to be found in Aristotle, or in the dictates of common sense—and to this, no reply. You affirmed, that the earliest record of Christianity, was the letter of Pliny. This point was called in question—and to this, no reply. You asserted, that Pliny, "by his own confession," knew nothing of the Christians before he came into Asia Minor. You were challenged to produce that confession, and the confession is not forthcoming.

You were charged with falsifying historical documents, and you confess an error of memory. These, Sir, I take to be so many concessions in my favour made by yourself; how far they authorise a triumph on your part, I will not say. They never would have been noticed by me, had you not been so anxious to produce a conviction on the minds of your readers, that you had "triumphantly refuted" me. I should have been content to leave them to avail what they might in the general discussion, but when a man strives to gain a victory by loud shouting, rather than by meeting difficulties, the claims of truth require that the hollowness of the sound should be exposed.

Unitarian Worthies.—No. 3, Thomas Emlyn.

(Concluded, from page 201.)

After about ten weeks absence, though Mr. Emlyn had received discouraging accounts of the rage that prevailed against him in Dublin, he thought it necessary to return to his family. Finding that both his opinions and his person lay under a great odium among many who knew little of the subject in dispute, he deemed it an act of justice to himself, and especially to the truth, to show what evidence there was in the Scriptures for the doctrine which he had embraced. Accordingly, he wrote his "Humble Inquiry into the Scripture account of Jesus Christ." A few days after this work was printed, our author intended to return to England; but some bigotted dissenters, hearing of his design, resolved to have him prosecuted. A special warrant was therefore obtained from the Lord Chief Justice (Sir Richard Pyne), to seize Mr. Emlyn and his books. He was accordingly brought before the Justice, and with some difficulty admitted to bail. The trial was delayed till June 14, 1693. On that day, Mr. Emlyn was informed by an eminent lawyer, that he would not be permitted to speak freely, but that it was designed to run him down like a wolf, without law or game; and he was soon convinced that this was not a groundless assertion. The indictment was for writing and publishing a book, wherein he had blasphemously and maliciously asserted, that Jesus Christ was not equal to God the Father, to whom he was subject; and this, with a seditious intention, or, to use some of the words of the indictment, "that Thomas Emlyn, &c. not having the fear of God before his eyes, nor yielding reverence to the true and orthodox holy Christian religion; but being wholly moved by the instigation of the Devil, and presumptuously treating of the Divinity of our Saviour, did write, and cause to be printed, a certain infamous and scandalous libel, with intent to disturb the peace and tranquillity of this kingdom, to seduce the pious, true, and faithful subjects of our Lady the Queen, from the true and sacred Christian faith." The first point to be proved on the trial, was, that Mr. Emlyn was the author of the book. The only evidence adduced, was that of Mr. Boyse, Mr. Emlyn's former co-pastor. He proved the agreement of the book with our confessor's sentiments, which amounted to the barest presumption. The Queen's

counsel contended that this was as good as positive evidence, and was seconded in this barefaced proceeding, by the Lord Chief Justice. In short, the torrent was so violent, that Mr. Emlyn's own counsel could not withstand it. The main question, however, related to the blasphemous nature of the publication. This was taken for granted—no proof of it was offered,—and Mr. Emlyn's counsel dared not to touch upon the subject; and our worthy was not permitted to speak for himself. In fine, the Jury brought him in guilty: of which verdict, when too late, some expressed their concern. The verdict being pronounced, the Attorney-General moved, that Mr. Emlyn might suffer the punishment of the pillory; but the passing of the sentence was deferred. In the mean time, Mr. E. was committed to the common jail. When he appeared for judgment, it was moved by one of the Queen's counsel, that he should retract; but to this our author would not consent. The Lord Chief Justice, therefore, proceeded to pronounce sentence upon him: which was, that he should suffer a year's imprisonment, pay a fine of a thousand pounds to the Queen, and lie in prison till he had paid it; and that he should find security for good behaviour during life. Then, with a paper on his breast, he was led round the four courts to be exposed. This sentence was, by some, thought to be severe and cruel; but the Lord Chief Justice did not scruple to magnify the mercy of it, because, in Spain and Portugal, the punishment would have been no less than burning. For a time, he remained in the custody of the under Sheriff of Dublin, then he was hurried to the common jail, where he lay among the prisoners in a close room filled with six beds, and then, by an habeas corpus, was removed to the Marshalsea on account of his health. During the whole time that he remained here, his former friends kept at a distance from him, and all offices of friendship and civility ceased. To this statement, an exception must be made in favour of the plainer tradesmen of his former congregation. But of all men, the dissenting ministers of Dublin were the most destitute of kindness. Not one of them, Mr. Boyse excepted, vouchsafed to Mr. E. that small office of humanity, the visiting of him in prison; nor had they so much pity on the soul of their erring brother, as they deemed him, as to endeavour to turn him from the error of his way. For a long time, our author continued with little appear-

ance of relief, content with this, that he knew for whom and for what he suffered. At length the exorbitant fine was reduced to seventy pounds, and was accordingly paid. Twenty pounds more were shamefully exacted by Dr. Marsh, Archbishop of Armagh, who, as Queen's almoner, had a claim of one shilling in the pound upon the whole fine. During Mr. E.'s confinement in the Marshalsea, he regularly preached there. We cannot forbear adding some remarks of Dr. afterwards Bishop Hoadly, on this unjust and illegal transaction. "Sometimes we of the Established Church can manage a *prosecution*, for I must not call it a *persecution*, ourselves, without calling in any other help. But I must do the *Dissenting Protestants* the justice to say, that they have shown themselves, upon occasion, very ready to assist us in so pious and Christian a work, as bringing heretics to their right mind: being themselves, but very lately, come from experiencing the convincing and enlightening faculty of a dungeon or a fine! This hath been experienced, particularly in Ireland, by one who could not see exactly what they saw, about the nature of Christ before his appearance in the world. For as with you, the Catholics, a man had better blaspheme Almighty God, than not magnify the Blessed Virgin; so with many of us, it is much more innocent, and less hazardous, to take from the glory of the Father, than of his Son. Nay, to bring down the Father to a level with his own Son, is a commendable work, and the applauded labour of many men of leisure. But to place the Son below his own Father, in any degree of real perfection, this is an unpardonable error; so unpardonable, that all hands are united against that unhappy man. And he found, at length, that he had much better have violated all God's commandments, than have interpreted some passages of Scripture differently from his brethren. The Non-conformists accused him—the Conformists condemned him—the Secular power was called in, and the cause ended in an imprisonment and very great fine: two methods of conviction about which the Gospel is silent."

The Church established, however, lent their aid to control and intimidate. The Bishops seated themselves on the bench at the trial—influenced the Judge—and the Judge terrified the Jury into a sentence of condemnation, telling them, with great anger, that if they acquitted Mr. E., "My Lords the Bishops were there;" and when the

Jury hesitated as to their verdict, sending to them to hasten their decision.

We shall quote a few sentences, which show the state of mind in which Mr. E. bore this infamous persecution. "After two years and a month, I was released from my bonds. But still there remains another and a more righteous judgment, where all, both high and low, shall stand and await the sentence of the Great Judge and Bishop of souls, who will surely reverse all erroneous judgments here: for he will render tribulation to them who have troubled others; but to them who are troubled, rest and peace; and they who conscientiously erred, will surely fare better than those who have persecuted them for such error. For they shall have judgment without mercy, who show no mercy. But I heartily and daily pray, this may never be the portion of any who have injured me; and, as I hope the good God will forgive me if I have erred, since he knows 'tis with sincerity, and that I suffer for what I take to be his truth and glory; so I also hope he will pardon them who have persecuted me only from a mistaken zeal; for they did it ignorantly in unbelief. And even after all, I thank my most merciful God and Father, that he called me not to this lot of suffering, till I was arrived at some maturity of judgment and firmness of resolution; that he supported my spirit to endure this trial of my faith without wavering; that I was never so cast down as to be tempted to renounce the truth; and that he has brought me out of prison; that I have yet food and raiment left me; and, above all, that he has given me a mind, I think, as well contented with it, as ever I was in my greatest prosperity. I am content to want the kind and vain respect of the world, and to give up my name to mistaken reproach, or to lose it, that it may be in silent unregarded obscurity. I have suffered the loss of many things, and do not repent; but upon the review, I do still count it all but dung and dross, if it has in any way advanced the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord. It is a further ground of rejoicing, to see the light of important truth breaking forth in many other parts, and spreading abroad its beautiful ray: that God has raised up divers others, bold enough to profess it, and able enough, with his assistance, to defend it."

After his release, Mr. E. returned to London, where a small congregation was formed for him. To them he

preached without stipend, although his fortune was reduced to a narrow income. The liberty of preaching, which he thus enjoyed, gave great offence to several persons; and after some years, his congregation was dissolved by the death of the principal persons who had attended upon his ministry. He retired into silent obscurity, but not to idleness, for the greater part of his life was diligently spent in supporting, by various works, the principles he had embraced, and the cause for which he suffered. These works were collected and published by his son; they have now become exceedingly scarce, and we cannot but wish, on account of their sterling excellence, that they might be given to the public in a new edition. On Friday, July 17, 1743, Mr. E. was suddenly taken ill in the night, but grew so far better as to be able, for some days, to converse with his friends, and to testify the great satisfaction he enjoyed in the consciousness of his integrity. His disorder returning, he departed this life on the 30th day of the month, in the 79th year of his age. He was one of the brightest examples of substantial unaffected piety, of serious rational devotion, of steady unshaken integrity, of undaunted Christian courage, that the annals of Christianity record. His knowledge was profound, his mind comprehensive and acute, and his heart disciplined by good and evil fortune, and imbued with the principles of the Gospel, was fixed upon God, and guided by his spirit.

G. C. S.

The Inspiration of the Scriptures.

(Concluded from page 184.)

It was for a long time doubted who were the authors of those Epistles which are called the 2d and 3d of John, the Epistle of St. James, and of St. Jude. This last, indeed, is very little else than a transcript of the 2d of St. Peter, the genuineness of which was also for a long time questioned, and still is scarcely acknowledged by many. After a very diligent search to collect into one body all the writings of the Apostles which could be found, those were preferred which at present stand in the Canon. The writings of the Apostles had preference to those of the other primitive Christians, because they had been with

Christ from the beginning of his public ministry, were eye and ear witnesses of his miraculous powers and heavenly doctrines; because they were immediately commissioned by Christ, and their commission was ratified by God himself, in the bestowing of miraculous gifts.*

These gifts were ultimately designed for the confirmation of that Christian doctrine which they taught. In Heb. ii. 34, we have the sum of their credentials, and how they were confirmed; but that what they wrote, was all immediately inspired by the Holy Spirit, or that they ever asserted that they were so inspired, is a thing entirely destitute of proof. It is readily granted, that they were possessed with a full and clear knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus; that what they taught is true, the *doctrine* of divine inspiration; that what they spoke, as well as what they wrote, was in words well suited to express their simple meaning.

The Council of Laodicea, A. D. 364, first adjusted the code of the Canon as it is at present received. Their decisions, as to what should, or what should not, be admitted as Scripture, were formed:—1st, From the authority conferred on the Apostles, and on this account, they admitted every letter known to be written by an Apostle which could be found; and, 2dly, with respect to those writings, whose authors were unknown or doubtful, they relied on other reasons common to us and them, and any others, and determined the genuineness according to the degree of probability resulting from a consideration of the circumstances.

Let any one read the Epistles attentively, and, I think, if prepossession has not obscured his intellectual vision, he must perceive that they contain some things which can never be supposed to be the subject of divine inspiration, or that require revelation†. That they had a revelation, and that what was revealed as far as it was necessary for the world to be made acquainted with it, was faithfully recorded, I readily and gratefully acknowledge. But does it appear, that the Apostles had any revelation of any new moral precepts or religious doctrine, which was not either previously known by the light of nature, or taught by Christ himself, while he continued with them

---

* Luke xxiv. 29; Acts ii. 43; Rom. xv. 18; 2 Cor. xii. 12.
† 1 Cor. i. 15; ix. 1, 5; Gal. vi. 11; Phil. ii. 27; 2 Tim. iv. 13, &c.

upon earth? They were, indeed, inspired with wisdom and eloquence to declare those precepts and those doctrines with all the power of persuasion and conviction, to perform miracles in confirmation of the truth of those glorious views of immortality, which were brought to light by the Gospel. What they were assured was divinely revealed, they peremptorily declared; but in other things they expressed themselves with diffidence. In many places, indeed, the Gospel was planted by other persons, who spoke as confidently as the Apostles themselves, and without referring to any of the Apostles' writings for authority or proof.

Intellectual light, and a pious disposition, are metonymically called the Law of God;* but they are only the knowledge of what is so, and the inclination to practise it. The law itself is uniformly obligatory on all, not variable as men's convictions are, and is either written or unwritten. The question with respect to the Epistles written by the Apostles, is this, Are they like statute books where the lawgiver every where speaks? Is every sentence to be considered as the Word of the Lord? Were the authors so inspired, that they could not possibly be in the dark in any thing, nor under the least mistake? I should be sorry to speak dogmatically, but I wish to suggest a few considerations.

In the first place, It does not appear that either of the authors of the Epistles were perfect characters. They were, indeed, excellent men; but they were not, in all respects, free from infirmities.† Nor was their knowledge absolutely perfect.‡

2dly, All that the Apostles taught orally—all that they preached from house to house—was as authentic, and as much the Word of God, as what they wrote, though that must necessarily be lost to us, because oral tradition is a means of conveying precepts and doctrines, which cannot be relied upon. What is the Book of the Acts, but an historical report, from notes taken by St. Luke (who travelled with St. Paul many years, and was also familiarly conversant with St. Peter), of the Apostles' transactions, and of the doctrines which they taught during their first propagation of the Gospel, and early settling of the Churches? And yet I have no hesitation in saying, that the Book of the Acts is more instructive to us, with

* Heb. viii. 10. † Gal. ii. 6, 11, 14. ‡ Acts xv. 9, 19; xxi. 18, 21, 24.

respect to the fundamentals of Christianity, than all the Epistles, which appear to have been written on several occasions and emergencies, to the Churches which were already settled.

3dly, It does not appear that the Apostles or Evangelists stood in the situation of lawgivers; that their authority was equal to that of Christ; or that he delegated to them any such authority as should ensure to every thing they wrote, the force of divine law, or universal obligation; or that they should be considered as the Amanuenses of the Holy Spirit. They were not lawgivers, but simply ministers of Christ,* limited in their commission to the teaching of those things which Christ had commanded them, and to the declaring of his divine authority.† They were, indeed, sometimes directed in the execution of their office, by extraordinary guidance and impulse;‡ and in the punctilios of order and discipline, it appears, that they were left to their discretion, with full power to use it.§ In such things, reason was sufficient to direct, and they might well be left mutable, to be hereafter altered and arranged, as the circumstances of Christianity might require. Some orders that they made, have long since ceased to be observed.‖

4thly, We can only come to a decision on the main subject of inquiry, by a careful search into the full extent of the commission originally given to the Apostles by Christ himself. What was the nature of it, and of the promise of the divine assistance in what they should do, and what they should teach? In what such promises differed from those which were applicable to their successors in the office of teaching, and what was common to them with all Christians? For all have the promise of some help of the Spirit to lead them to the truth.¶ The Spirit certainly never leads any one wrong; but many may err in thinking they are led by it, when, in fact, they are only following a phantom of imagination.**

The sum of their commission was simply to preach the Gospel of Christ—to declare the glad tidings of salvation, of the terms and hopes of which he had been the Messenger.†† And in order to assure them of sufficient

---

* 1 Cor. i. 13; iii. 5. 1 Tim. i. 12. † Mat. xxviii. 20; Acts x. 42. Acts ‡ xix. 33. § 1 Cor. xi. 34. ‖ James v. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 20; 1 Pet. v. 14; 1 Tim. v. 9; 1 Cor. xi. 34, &c. &c. ¶ Luke xi. 13; 1 John ii. 27. ** 1 Cor. xiii. 9. †† Mat. xxviii. 19, 20; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47; Rom. xv, 8, 9; Heb. iii. 1, 2; 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3, 4; Acts xx. 21, 24.

power and ability to execute their commission, they had an express promise of the help of the Holy Spirit, to preserve them from error and mistake in what they taught, that they might not defeat the intention of Christ, in publishing to the world the essential truths of his doctrine.* These promises, in their primary sense, were peculiar to those who conversed with him in this world; yet not to the exclusion of others, who might afterwards be called in an extraordinary manner to assist in the great work.† The essentials of this religion, were, no doubt, infallibly delivered and faithfully preserved in the primitive churches,‡ before any writing on the subject was in existence.

From all the consideration which I am able to give the subject, I cannot find in the Scripture any proof that we are required to look upon every thing which any Apostle has left upon record, as the Word of God delivered in every particular by inspiration. The Apostles certainly would not teach any thing as the Gospel of Christ, either by word or by writing, of which they had any doubt or hesitation with respect to its divine authority; but it does not necessarily follow, that every word they spoke, and all that they committed to writing, was immediately dictated by the Holy Spirit. Suppose one of the Apostles were now living, would he be able to put an end to all the contests in the Christian world, which the Bible itself cannot settle? Must we impute all the obscurities in the Sacred Writings (and obscure they undoubtedly are in many parts), to the Holy Spirit? No, rather to the human infirmities of the writers, who, in treating of subjects so sublime, could not express themselves in language so simple and perspicuous, as to convey their meaning to the mind of every reader, so as to prevent the possibility of a mistake.

As long as men will look upon religion as consisting of correct opinions, rather than in moral practice, while they search more into the metaphysical, than the ethical, the practical doctrines of the Gospel, I do not see how the controversies, which shame Christianity, are to have an end, till some fixed laws of interpretation shall be agreed upon by all sects, and constantly adhered to. Men will

---

* John xvi. 13; xiv. 26. † Acts i. 21, 22.
‡ 1 Cor. xv. 11; 2 Tim. i. 13.

find their different opinions in the Bible, and stake their lives that others do not or will not understand the text. Every one who observes, can readily perceive, how much soever Christians of every denomination refer "to the Law and the Testimony," yet the favourite systems of divinity, do, in reality, decide the Articles of Belief, and though some authority must be referred to, yet as the Church believes, is, after all, with nearly every sect, the only way of determining controversies.

Verses to the Memory of Howard, the Philanthropist.
[*From the Alma Mater, a Series of Original Pieces, by Students of the University of Glasgow*, 1828.]

SHALL the bloody deeds of the warlike plain,
Still cumber the minstrel's line?
And shall we not raise one purer strain
In honour of acts like thine,
That were wrought afar from the gaze of men
In the haunts of guilt and in sorrow's den?

Wherever the dungeon's gloom was deep,
And galling the captive's chain—
There were the laurels thou soughtest to reap
By the couch of guilt and pain:
Earthly and cold must the spirit be,
That kindleth not at thy memory!

Thy course was onward, and onward still,
No danger could turn thee aside;
For thou hadst a high behest to fulfil,
And couldst not be satisfied
Till thy heart had perform'd the holy command,
Engraved on its core by thy Maker's hand!

It was not amid the glittering camp,
With multitudes gazing around,
But deep in the dungeon's stifling damp
That thou wert labouring found,
Calmly, and deeply, and silently,
Like him that works for eternity.

And the warrior's brightest wreath is dim
And worthless, compared with thine;
For thou hast received thy reward with Him
Who dwelleth in light divine;
For there, and only there could be,
The mighty prize that was worthy thee.

And 'twere prouder far to fill thy grave
On the distant Russian shore,
Where in mid career on the errand to save,
God said—that thy task was o'er,
Than to sleep with kings in pompous state
Amid the undistinguished great.

Pilgrim of mercy! rest thee well!
Around the judgment throne
A thousand grateful tongues shall tell
The deeds that thou hast done,
Upon that dread accounting day,
When earth and time shall depart away! E. P.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Ireland, January, 1828.

Sir,

Allow me to express my gratification at the perusal of some of the numbers of your useful and highly interesting Pioneer. Such a miscellany is much needed in this Island.

The ennobling principles of Non-conformity, have been much neglected, and seemingly forgotten, in the contentions of the two mighty Episcopacies, which afflict this land.

The Baptists, who formerly were pretty numerous, have been gradually declining. Some, the General Baptists, verged so near the doctrines of Arminius, and yet preached those doctrines so coldly, that many, like the moth round a candle, were attracted by the burning zeal of the Methodists; while others, the Particular Baptists, not pleased with the want of energy, on *their* particular doctrines, in their preachers, have, by degrees, united themselves to the Independents. There is now no Baptist Church in Dublin; and the one in Cork, scarcely deserves the name, having only about fifteen members, which compose the whole congregation.

The Unitarians—or as some still class themselves under the dubious title of *Presbyterians*—kept down by the golden chain of the *Regium donum*, scarce dare to avow their different doctrines, nor even their direct opposition to the Established Church. And the Independents, engrossed in the fiery doctrines of Calvin, care little to acknowledge their secession from Alma Mater, and have grown numerous and commanding, from the co-operation of many of the Calvinists of the Church of England. But a spirit of inquiry is abroad, excited by the repeated collision of the two Establishments, which it will be very difficult for them to allay, and the end of which they little know.

It is in this state of things, I think, such a periodical as the Pioneer should be widely circulated. The minds of men are unsettled; the well-informed Roman Catholic, doubting the full authority of his Church, is yet very loathe to yield his assent to that Church, which, though not the Scarlet Lady herself, has pretty strong claims to the relationship of a sister. And the good political Protestant, who detests a Catholic as one tainted, is not a little surprised to find his *reformed* Church so very similar in doctrine, and worship, and forms, and ceremonies, to that of the one he abhors.

But the Roman Catholics are much the worst off. If they refuse the authority of tradition, and fasts, and observances of penance, are they to join a Church which partly acknowledges and partly denies them? No: they cannot. Yet to what will they flee? On what ground can they stand? I fear too often they lose themselves among the bewildering mazes of infidelity. They see the errors of their own Church, and wander about, without a guide, without an object. It is then that your Pioneer should clear the way, should cut down the underwood, and surmounting his difficulties, open to his view a path "through golden vistas into heaven."

I am glad to see the Pioneer, also, because I think it goes to rebut the argument which has been urged, I fear with too much truth, at least here, against the Unitarians, for want of zeal in their religion. It is asked, "Where are their periodicals—their missionaries? Other sects exert themselves with a conscious integrity, for the spread of their opinions, and send missionaries abroad with Christian zeal and interest in the eternal happiness of their fel-

low-creatures. But the Socinians or Unitarians, cloak over their opinions, and with the *odium theologicum* on them, fear to stand forth and avow what they think truth! Their ministers, also, exert themselves but little; and where other sects have, with one preacher, two services on the Sunday, and one in the week, they are satisfied with the cold formality of *one* on the Sabbath, and for this they have *two* ministers."

We must acknowledge the truth of the latter part of this accusation; the former is answered by the number of excellent periodicals now published by the Unitarians; but, I think, it may be fairly put down to that gag, the Regium donum. When that shall be removed from the mouth of the Unitarians of this country, then, and not till then, will the Unitarians be able to stand forth like men, and openly endeavour to propagate the pure and undefiled religion of Jesus. To this charge we have, undoubtedly, some few exceptions, yet they are only exceptions; but the principal cause of the decline and tergiversation of many sincere Christians, has been the ignorance of what they believed.

A brighter day is, however, now breaking on Ireland; and as the day-spring of truth is beaming on us, I fervently pray, it may not be long before we shall be witnesses of its meridian splendour.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

N. E.

REVIEW.

Memoirs of the Life, Writings, and Opinions of the Rev. Samuel Parr, LL. D. by the Rev. William Field, Vol. 1.

We notice the work above mentioned, in order to extract from it some passages in proof of the evangelical character of the creed of the subject of the memoirs, as well as to lay before our readers one or two other particulars calculated to recommend correct principles.

The eloquent writer gives us the following account of the candour and liberality of Dr. Parr: "His great and amiable candour, a virtue in the spirit and practice of which, it may almost be said that he was perfect. Such was the warm breathing, and such the wide extent of his charity, that spurning the narrow bounds of mere tol-

erance, he felt exactly the same respectful regard for the sincere and virtuous of all denominations, as for those of his own. He had the happiness, at Norwich, to be surrounded by a number of the clergy possessed of the same enlightened views, who rose with a noble superiority like himself above the prejudices which too often divide men of real worth from each other, and who were disposed and even eagerly desirous to cultivate the good opinion, and as opportunity offered, the acquaintance and friendship of those whose religious creed differed from their own. High indeed was the indignation which throbbed in his bosom, whenever he spoke of that unhappy spirit of censorious and intolerant bigotry, which in later years has too much pervaded the clerical body, undoubtedly with some splendid exceptions, more especially when he contrasted with it the wise moderation, the kind charity, the generous courtesy, towards those of differing opinions, which distinguished the clergy in the early part of his own life, and in the times immediately preceding. 'Which of our dignitaries of those times,' he would often say to the present writer, 'our Herring, our Conybeare, and Hoadley,—our Butler, our Benson, our Waddington, and Law, did not think themselves honoured by the esteem and the friendly regards of your Watts, your Doddridge, and your Lardner,—your Benson, your Chandler, and your Farmer.' But now thundering out with angry look and impassioned gesture, he would exclaim, 'Oh, what a difference!—to the good mind, how distressful!—to the right mind, how disgustful!' Then softening a little, and speaking half seriously, half jocosely, 'How I wish to be on the bench, were it only to show, to all about me, the example of a wiser and a better spirit!'" In unison with this spirit, Dr. Parr cultivated a friendly connection with the Rev. Samuel Bourn, and the Rev. George Morgan, successively the ministers of the Unitarian chapel at Norwich.

Dr. Parr thus delivered his sentiments on the subject of Catholic emancipation: "In the present condition of the world, that restless and relentless temper, which once actuated the members of the Church of Rome, is visibly assuaged: a spirit of inquiry has imperceptibly, in speculative points, produced a spirit of moderation; and few, if any, of the practical mischiefs, which Popery might formerly have brought down upon us, are any longer to be dreaded. Gladly, therefore, should I hail the day, in

which the religious tenets of the Roman Catholics should not be permitted to obstruct the full recovery of their civil rights; and in which the Church of England, providing at once for its own interest and its own honour, should display to every other Church, a glorious example of holding the faith in the unity of the spirit and the bond of peace."

Mr. Field is a Unitarian minister at Warwick, and after the removal of Dr. Parr to that neighbourhood, there subsisted between him and Mr. Field, the most friendly intercourse. "Their conversation on the various subjects of literature, morals, religion, and politics, when alone, was checked by no reserve, and fettered by no restraint. Their opinions *sometimes* differed; yet rarely did that difference create, even for a moment, one unpleasant thought, and never one angry feeling." This passage makes it evident, that at least Dr. Parr was not rigidly orthodox, either in his creed or his spirit. Dr. Parr attended the services and the dinner which took place on the occasion of the introduction of Mr. Field to the ministerial office at Warwick, when Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham conducted the worship.

The following passage merits attention, especially in this day, when lengthy and mysterious creeds are deemed the only passports to heaven. "Very few and very simple are the truths, which we have, any of us, a right to pronounce necessary to salvation. It is extremely unsafe to bewilder the judgment, or to inflame the passions of men, upon those abstruse subjects of controversy, about which bigots indeed may dogmatise with fierce and imperious confidence; whilst they who are scholars without pedantry, and believers without superstition, are content to differ from each other, with sentiments of mutual respect and mutual forbearance." Dr. Parr entertained the highest opinion of Dr. Priestley. "There is not a man living," he says, "who has a more sincere veneration for his talents and his virtues than I have." Speaking of two sermons of Dr. Priestley's—the one, *On the duty of not living to ourselves;* the other, *On habitual devotion*—"I confidently affirm," he says, "that the wisest man cannot read them, without being wiser; nor the best man, without being better." "The high estimation," writes his biographer, "in which he ever held his (Dr. P's.) talents and his moral worth, was raised still higher, by commiseration for

sufferings so great and unmerited, endured by Dr. Priestley at the time of the disgraceful Birmingham riots, and by admiration of the calm composure, so worthy the philosopher, and of the magnanimous forgiveness so becoming the Christian, with which they were endured." After Dr. Priestley's flight from Birmingham, Dr. Parr wrote to him frequent letters of condolence or advice; and when far removed from his native land, Dr. Parr still followed him with kindly and friendly sympathy, and never shrunk from the task, invidious and even dangerous as it then was, of standing forth in attestation of his merits, or in vindication of his honourable fame, against all his ignorant or malignant opposers. "His attainments," wrote Dr. Parr, "are numerous, almost without a parallel; his talents are superlatively great; his morals correct without austerity, and exemplary without ostentation; they present to common observers, the innocence of a hermit, and the simplicity of a patriarch; and the philosopher's eye will at once discover in them, the deep-fixed root of virtuous principle, and the solid trunk of virtuous habit. Nor can I *think his religion insincere, because he worships One Deity in the name of our Saviour.*"

Of Mr. Belsham, too, Dr. Parr always "spoke in terms of high regard, and often expressed admiration of his talents as a man, of his attainments as a scholar, and his powers as a writer." His translation of the Epistles, Dr. Parr considered as one of the most important theological works that have appeared for a century past. Of the preliminary dissertation in particular, as a clear, reasonable, and judicious exposition of the principles which ought to guide every translator of the Apostolic writings, Dr. Parr declared the most unqualified approbation. "With the author of that dissertation," said he, on one occasion, to the present writer, "I go along smoothly and delightfully from the beginning to the end, with perfect accordance of sentiment and the most complete satisfaction of mind." "Yes," said he, upon another occasion, "this is indeed a work, of which those of your Church may well be proud, and with which the reasonable of every Church might well be pleased." Dr. Parr had once the intention to write the life of an intimate friend and school-fellow, the justly celebrated, pious, and deeply learned Sir William Jones. This, however, he did not execute, and, if we are rightly informed, the true cause is to be found in the intervention

of some friends, who feared that Dr. Parr might explicitly state the truth, as to the heterodoxy of Sir W. Jones' creed. This great man, in fact, was a Unitarian, and Mr. Field convicts his biographer Lord Teignmouth, of at least great disingenuousness in concealing his real opinions, and garbling his writings, in order to adduce something like proof of his orthodoxy. "Dr. Parr," says Mr. Field, "often asserted in the hearing of the present writer, as from his own knowledge, that so far from admitting the popular views of Christianity, Sir W. Jones held those which are commonly distinguished by the name of Unitarianism. That assertion is indeed proved, as far as negative proof can go, by the passages from his writings produced by Lord Teignmouth in the "Memoirs." In all these, it is impossible not to mark the total absence of every expression, which might imply the admission of such a theological system, as that attributed to him by his biographer. Every one of his devotional pieces, and all his observations of a religious kind, proceed upon the principles of what the learned Dr. Lardner calls the ancient Nazarene doctrine, or that of the early Jewish Christians," *i. e.* Unitarianism. In some degree, on the authority of those very passages, and still more on the decisive authority of Dr. Parr, the writer thinks himself warranted in placing Sir W. Jones amongst the members of the Anti-Trinitarian and Anti-Calvinistic schools of Christian philosophers, and of adding his illustrious name to those of Newton, Locke, and Milton,—of Clarke, Tucker, Hartley, and Law.

The celebrated scholar and ardent friend of liberty, Mr. Wakefield, who was alike Catholic in his spirit and Unitarian in his creed, was, amongst all his friends and admirers, and he had many, by few admired and loved more than by Dr. Parr. Mr. Field informs us, "For my part," says Dr. Parr, "I shall ever think and ever speak of Mr. Wakefield, as a very profound scholar, as a most honest man, and as a Christian who united knowledge with zeal, piety with benevolence, and the simplicity of a child, with the fortitude of a martyr."

It no longer admits of a question, that Sir W. Jones was a Unitarian, and those who have read this paper candidly, will perhaps be convinced, that in this particular, as in many others, Dr. Parr agreed with the sentiments of his learned and pious friend. If, however, any doubt remains, it must disappear at the following statement. Dr. Parr

had collected a large library, consisting of not less than 10,000 volumes. In the books, he was accustomed to write down his remarks, with a view to their publication in the catalogue of his library. This catalogue has now been published, and pretends to set forth the opinions of Dr. Parr, as recorded in his books. But in one particular, at least, there has been the greatest disingenuousness. Dr. Parr had in his library, a book with the following title: "The Divinity of Christ proved from his own declarations, &c." by Bishop Burgess. There follows in the printed catalogue, the following remark of Dr. Parr: "From the eminently learned and truly pious author." But it has been proved, that as the note stands in the original manuscript, the following words succeed those above quoted: "*He does not convince me.*" "Few, but significant words!" exclaims the detector of the artifice. "To my mind," adds he, on the subject of Dr. Parr's religious opinions, "these few words speak volumes. It is reported," continues Mr. Field, "that other omissions equally important, have been discovered by means of printed copies of cancelled sheets, which have found their way into the hands of several persons, by some of whom it is hoped they will be given to the public."

We have been so much gratified and instructed by reading this the present volume of the Memoirs, that we anxiously expect the second and concluding one.

G. C. S.

The true Worshippers, not those who worship the Trinity; a serious Address to Trinitarians, by a Dissenter from Trinitarianism.

THE writer of the piece which bears the above title, has already appeared before the public, in several useful tracts written upon the points at issue between Trinitarians and Unitarians; but in no one has he succeeded better in setting forth the cogency of truth, than in that which we now notice. The author deduces his arguments exclusively from Scripture, beginning with John iv. 23, "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the *Father* in spirit and in truth; for the *Father seeketh* such to worship *him*." Such an explicit statement, proceeding from such authority, is adequate to decide the

controversy, whether or not the Father be the supreme and only God. Luke x. 1, 2, is next adduced, where our Saviour, being solicited by his disciples to teach them to pray, does not direct them to say, "O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons in one God;" nor, "O God, the Father of heaven, have mercy upon us; O God, the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us; O God, the Holy Ghost," proceeding from the Father and the Son, "have mercy upon us;" but, "When ye pray, say, Our *Father* which art in heaven, hallowed be *thy* name," &c. Similar is the injunction in Mat. vi. 6, 9, "Pray to *thy Father*," and in Luke xi. 13, the Father, we are taught, answers as well as hears our prayers, "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask *him*." Mark xi. 25, 26, corrobates this conclusion, "That your *Father* also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses." To which the language of our Lord, John xv. 16, may be added, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the *Father* in my name, *he* will give it you." If it were possible for these passages to leave a doubt, whether or not Jesus was to receive divine worship, that doubt must disappear, in reading the following express injunction of Christ, John xvi. 23, "In that day," after his resurrection, "ye shall *ask me* nothing. Verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." As in every case, so in this, the practice of our Lord was in strict unison with his precept; and, accordingly, we find that he prays, not to his divine nature—not to God the Holy Ghost—not to the holy and blessed Trinity, but exclusively to the Father, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps. Mat. xi. 25, 26, "I thank thee, *O Father*, Lord of heaven and earth." "Even so *Father*, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Mat. xxvi. 39, 42, "*O my Father*, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." John xi. 41, 42, "*Father*, I thank thee that thou hast heard me; and I knew that *thou hearest me always*." Let the worshipper of a Trinity read that most beautiful and touching chapter, the 17th of John's Gospel, and he can scarcely, we think, fail to observe the contrast there subsists between the prayers of Jesus and his own, relatively to the object to whom they are addressed. If, then, the Father is the only proper object of worship—a point as clear as Scrip-

ture can make it—then, by the clearest inference, the Father is the only God, agreeably to the teaching of Paul, "To us there is one God, the Father;" and the assertion of Jesus, "This is life eternal, to know thee, the Father, to be the only true God." For religious worship is the peculiar right of God; and he who claims the exclusive appropriation of it, to whom only it is due, is the only God. In consequence, Jesus Christ is not God, except Jesus Christ be his own Father. However high, then, the character or the nature which he possessed, he is not God. The establishment, therefore, of the supremacy of the Father, and there are many other modes of proof than that now alluded to, is the decision of most of the questions controverted by Unitarians. Is it asserted, for instance, that Jesus is God? The answer is, "To us there is but one God, the Father." Is it asserted, that he has two natures? That does not make him the Supreme God; for "the Father" only is "*above* all." However exalted, then, he was, or is imagined to be, the Father is supreme, and Jesus subordinate. Thus is established the essential principle of Unitarianism, the rights of the Sovereign of the universe vindicated, and a Supreme Father, and, consequently, infinite benignity, regarded as the presiding agent over human destiny. We cannot conclude these remarks better than by a quotation from a tract, the production of that eloquent and profound writer, Dr. Southwood Smith:—

"When the disciples of our Lord, perceiving that he, like themselves, was in the daily habit of praying to the Father, and to no other person or being, expressly asked him if this practice were right, and he assured them that it was, by directing them to continue the use of the common language,—could they possibly believe that they were to worship two other persons besides the one invocated in the form prescribed? Could they conceive that Jesus Christ himself was one of those other persons? He whose most humble and devout addresses to the Father they so often witnessed, could they imagine that this very being was the Father, or an essential part of the Father? If so, to whom could they suppose that *his* devotions were addressed? Could they imagine it was God praying to God; or were they aware it was his human addressing his divine nature? Suppose this to be true, must not the discovery of it have overwhelmed them with amazement? When first the conviction of it entered their minds, must it not have absorbed all their faculties in astonishment and awe! When they came to discover that a Being who had every appearance and property of a man; with whom they had always associated as such; whom they had seen hungry and athirst; whose weary steps, as he travelled from place to place, on the business of benevolence, they had so often accompanied; whose slumbers they had

watched, and to the wants of whose nature they had so often ministered; when they came to discover that this being was not what he appeared, and what they had hitherto supposed; that he was not a man, but the self-existent and immortal God; or, at the same time, both God and man,—what a moment must that have been? What amazement, what awe must have seized them? With what reverence must they have approached him? When in future they saw him kneeling down to pray, when they watched him wrapped in devotion,—how must they have looked one upon the other? How must that extraordinary situation, for that most extraordinary Being, have impressed their minds? Is it possible that it should never have caused a single expression of surprise to escape them? Or that, when they were commissioned by this wonderful personage, to disclose these astonishing facts to the world, they should never speak of the error into which they at first fell; of the manner in which it was removed; of the sensations that overwhelmed them on the discovery of the stupendous truth; that, on the contrary, they should continue to speak to him, and of him, as if none of these things had ever happened; that they should represent him in all manner of situations but that one which must have been infinitely more memorable and interesting to them than any other, and should give him all manner of high and dignified appellations but that one which is most exalted of all, and the most descriptive of his nature? The term God-man, essential to the hypothesis that Jesus Christ possesses a human and divine nature, was invented as soon as the doctrine was conceived; but being altogether absent from the minds of the writers of the New Testament, the term which is descriptive of it, is no where to be found in the records of his life and doctrine.

"To conclude. What is it renders any body of Christians worthy of the esteem and friendship of their brethren? Is it an invariable and close adherence to the Scriptures? Unitarians contend, that they can not only express every peculiarity of their faith in the very words of Scripture, but that there are no other words by which they can express them with so much precision and energy. Are they asked concerning their faith in God? They answer in the words of Paul, "To us there is but one God, the Father." 1 Cor. viii. 6.—Are they questioned concerning his nature? They reply in the words of John, "God is love." 1 John iv. 8.—Are they asked concerning their belief in Christ? They answer with Peter, "Jesus of Nazareth *is* a man approved of God by signs and wonders, which God did by him." Acts ii. 22.—Are they questioned concerning his office? They say with Paul, "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. But what other sect is there that can thus express the peculiarities of their faith in the language of Scripture? Where do the Trinitarians find their favourite phrases, Trinity, Triune God, incarnate God, God-man?

"These are some of the considerations which weigh upon the minds of Unitarians, which they can remove by no effort, and to which they call the serious and solemn attention of their fellow-christians."

G. C. S.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

I offer for insertion in your periodical, the former portion of a discourse, delivered last New-Year's-Day; should the remarks which it contains, appear of sufficient interest and importance to render it expedient to present them to the public, through the medium of your pages, the remaining portion shall be duly forwarded. This, from one who sympathises deeply in all your exertions towards the establishment of vital and primitive Christianity in Scotland, and who prays the God of Truth to bless both you and yours. PETER.

A New-Year's-Day Discourse.

Eccles. viii. 5,—A wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment.
Also, Eph. v. 14,—Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.

ANOTHER year has passed away. We have made another stride towards our graves, which appear standing out, in the dim and shadowy perspective of futurity—rising before us in a more magnified aspect—glowing with a more startling brightness—defined with a more appalling distinctness!—and many, who, at its commencement, stood firmly and fondly by our sides, radiant in youthful comeliness and grace—boastful in the conscious elevation and display of power, and exulting in the freshness and smiling promise of the new paths which were opening up before them—stretching out in rich and variegated vista—or venerable in the decline of their days—their hoary head encircled by a radiant halo of many an endeared remembrance—have fallen into theirs, and are now sleeping the sleep of death! Ere the one on which we have just entered, shall have told its hours, we may be lying, stiffened and shrouded, beside them! This is an awful subject of contemplation:—"Our hopes and fears start up alarmed, and o'er life's narrow verge look down—on what?—a fathomless abyss, a dread eternity!"

Many and sad are the mementoes that abound both within our own breasts, and in the world without us, to call our attention to the rapid flight of time. The little green hillocks that swell, side by side, in the church-yard, press upon the heart of the parent, and tell her in language, O how audible! that the period *has been*, when

her steps, *now* lonely and joyless, were thronged by a gay group of laughter-loving innocents, wantoning in the heartsome glee of childhood, each striving who should present the gaudiest flower to deck the bosom of its mother! The path matted over with weeds—the flowers littering the soil with rank luxuriance—the honey-suckle untrained around the trellised porch, waving heavily to the midnight breeze, like drooping banners over a warrior's tomb—the low dull moaning of the crumbling harp, breathed in fitful sighs, responsive to the wintry blast—speak of a home now desolate, once the abode of intelligence, peace, and innocence—of a hearth now deserted, once the centre of domestic happiness and social mirth. The wild notes of frantic melody, that fall upon the ear in heart-rending numbers, as we pass the cell of the brain-stricken maniac, speak of a period, when a heart, now cracked and jarred, throbbed light, and quick, and joyous, and shot forth the tendrils of a pure, and fervid, and hallowed affection. Alas! that such promise should have withered beneath the blight of neglect! And a voice now hoarse and dissonant, discoursed most exquisite music; and a frame now manacled to a dungeon's floor, sprung graceful and free, like an antelope over the mountains!

But it is not alone from the changes that take place *without us*, that we are forced to note the lapse of time; our own heart is a fertile field for observance, replete with solemn warnings, and wise admonitions, and holy lessons, which, would we but mark, and fasten our regards upon, and appropriate to our moral necessities, would yet work out a glorious regeneration of the character, and cause to emanate from *within*, a manifestation of excellence, bearing upon its front, in legible and enduring characters, "*Glory to God* in the highest, and on earth *peace, good will towards men.*"

He alone, who, after having walked the scenes of life, and surrendered himself to its manifold and intoxicating, and seemingly felicitous enchantments, seeks the bosom of retirement, and in quiet and sober feeling, undertakes the severe task of a faithful and impartial examination of self—can truly estimate, with how impressive an announcement, the changes that take place in the human heart, intimate to us the lapse of time. We look for the simple-heartedness and single-mindedness of childhood, and, in its place, uncover the low cunning of fraud, and

the craft of ignorance. We search for the young and springy shoots, that bore, in their growth, so great a promise of thriving, and much fruitfulness; and we stumble over the withered objects of stunted decrepitude. We seek for the fresh and burning ardour, that in boyhood threw a bright and healthy glow upon the every, even the most barren, pursuit in which we engaged, and that regarded *difficulty* as merely a stimulus and a triumph to its strong and nervous energies, and disdain its recognition in the sordid hoardings of the miser, or the querulous and impotent vapourings of the gasconade. With fear and trembling, we trace out the dark and turbid current of the affections, hoping yet to find, pure and untainted, their welling-head, deeming that the pollution of their waves may have been imbibed from the corrupted channel, in which for so long a period they had held their course; but, alas! the *spring* is foul! Oh! when we thus take a review of our present tendencies, habits, feelings, pursuits, and principles, and compare them with the promise of our youth, how do we long for a return to its innocent and unpalling enjoyments! How do we yearn after its unruffled tranquillity—its unprompted cheerfulness! How do we sigh for its robust and generous sensibilities! How do we burn for its unsullied purity—its unstained honour—its unbroken integrity! How do we ask for the old paths! How are we brought with bitter tears, and burning shame, and dejected forms, and in humble prostration of soul, to observe the lapse of time!

Having made these observations suggested to me, by the occasion of the services of this day, let us endeavour, further to improve it, by considering the information of my text, that "a wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment;" and consider in what manner we may most profitably improve the every passing hour, viewed as carrying us forward to the bar of final retribution.

(To be Continued.)

The Lot of Humanity.

With soothing murmurs soft and low,
And gentle current rippling slow,
The stream through sunny vales may flow,
Or flowery meadows, glide;

Or it may rush with foaming course,
Through mountain-pass its torrent hoarse,
Or wildly dash, with headlong force,
O'er rocks its rapid tide:
Though not a break its smoothness curl,
Though through steep glens its eddies whirl,
Or o'er wild rocks its waters hurl,
At length 'twill reach the sea:
And blended with the mighty deep,
Its gentle wave no more may sleep,
Or still its rapid current keep,
Forever whelm'd 'twill be.

Thus we in pleasure's path may tread,
And peace her halcyon wings may spread,
And joy's bright beam be o'er us shed,
And scarce a care annoy;
Or we may bend 'neath want's keen blast,
While hopeless griefs our days o'ercast,
And woe's dark tempests thickening fast,
Our every hope destroy:
But though in joy our hours be spent,
Though scarce a ray of sunshine lent,
We oft to misery's blast have bent,
At length we yield our breath!

The happy, wretched, gay, and grave,
All—all—are whelm'd in one dark wave,—
No earthly mandate aught can save
From thy dread gulf, O Death!

[The following Correspondence has been forwarded to us for insertion. We gladly give it a place in our pages. The first letter is another proof of the progress of inquiry; the spirit of the second one excites compassion, whilst it must call forth additional desires to promote the knowledge of that pure and undefiled religion, which looks with benevolent eye on all virtuous men, whatever be their opinions.—Edit.]

To the Members of East Gorbals and Hutchesontown Sabbath Evening School Society.

My Christian Friends,

From my former attendance on your Schools and Monthly Meetings, I cannot doubt my late absence may have

excited some surprise. Highly approving, as I do, the object of your united exertions—the instruction of the young—I feel it but an act of justice to you as well as to myself, to assign the reasons of my withdrawal from my former labours.

Believing that no subject is of so great importance to a human being as religion, my thoughts have long been anxiously engaged upon the various subjects connected with it. Brought up in the belief of the Assembly's Catechism, I felt no hesitation in complying with the requisition of your Society, and signing, when I became a Member, my assent to the doctrines contained in it. Always wishful to improve my mind, and fond of tracing the hand and benevolence of God in his works, I was led on from step to step, till at length I could not reconcile the idea of the condemnation of the heathen, for want of knowledge which they never had in their power to acquire, with the fatherly character of the God of Nature. I thought long and seriously on this subject; I read the Bible with anxiety and with carefulness, till I was convinced from its general teachings, that the Apostle's declaration expressed the truth, that "God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him."

Having thus satisfied my mind as to the incorrectness of the common notions on this doctrine, I was naturally led to examine whether the other opinions I had been taught to believe, were not equally unfounded in Nature and Scripture. Many a distressing day have I passed, before I could bend my prejudices to what I saw the Bible taught me. I struggled against the evidence which met me almost on every page, as long as I could; but it was of no use, I could not resist the instructions of the Word of God, though they did oblige me to give up many of the doctrines in which I had been educated; and when once convinced that the popular doctrines were unscriptural as well as irrational, I could not conceal my convictions—I could not submit to dishonest shame, and fear man rather than God.

My present belief, is that which the Saviour himself declared to be the truth: "The Lord our God is One Lord." I joyfully acknowledge with my honoured Master, in solemn prayer to his Father, "This is life eternal, to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." I embrace with gratitude the consoling doctrine, that "The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." I look forward to a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust. I am assured, that we must all appear before the judgement-seat of Christ, to receive according to the things done in the body, whether they have been good, or whether they have been evil; and that then cometh the end, when Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; then shall the Son himself be subject to him that did put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Though these are my present opinions, because I believe they are those which the Bible teaches, I would be far from supposing that they alone are all the truth. I am as willing now still farther

to inquire as ever. I am ready to listen to any evidence which may be brought forward in support of the doctrines I have conscientiously felt called upon to abandon. It is not from reading controversial books that I have been led to give up my former faith; the Bible has been my teacher, and by its teachings I must abide.

Though I therefore most respectfully withdraw as a Member of your Society, if you still insist on Subscription to the Assembly's Confession of Faith, yet I would willingly bear my part in the labours of the Schools, if acknowledgement of belief in the Bible were sufficient; and I would earnestly call upon all of you, not to condemn my opinions without examining them fairly for yourselves. Let me pray you to study more and more the Word of God; in it you will find the character of Deity sketched, and his love in sending his Son, set forth in lively characters, calculated to awaken within us every feeling of gratitude and love: interpret its teachings not by the Confession but by itself. And that the Father of Lights may lead you into the perception and practice of the truth as it is in Jesus, and that the Schools under your care may flourish and do much good, is the ardent prayer of,

MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,

Yours sincerely,

J. M.

February, 1828.

To Mr. J. M.

DEAR SIR,

THE Sabbath School Society, deeply convinced that the chief doctrines which you have renounced, stand intimately connected with the salvation of the soul, and are the all in all of Divine Revelation—and feelingly alive to the everlasting welfare of the young committed to their care—with feelings of deep sympathy, last night accepted of your resignation of your membership.

It is my earnest prayer, that that Divine Redeemer, that Ransomer of the slaves of sin, who is "the Child born and the Son given," and at the same time, "the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, the True God, and Eternal Life," may open your eyes, as he did those of Bartimeus of old, that you may experience the preciousness of his "blood which cleanses from all sin."

Deeply commiserating your case, and feeling a lively interest in your everlasting welfare, and praying that you may yet "be brought to sit at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in your right mind,"

I remain, DEAR SIR,

Your unworthy well-wisher,

J. G.

Friday, February, 8, 1828.

"*Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, occasioned by the publication of Scott's Life of Napoleon.*"

(Continued from page 209.)

"As another means employed by Bonaparte for giving strength and honour to his government, we may name the grandeur of his public works, which he began in his consulate, and continued after his accession to the imperial dignity. These dazzled France, and still impress travellers with admiration. Could we separate these from his history, and did no other indication of his character survive, we should undoubtedly honour him with the title of a beneficent sovereign; but connected as they are, they do little or nothing to change our conceptions of him as an all-grasping, unprincipled usurper. Paris was the chief object of these labours; and surely we cannot wonder, that he who aimed at universal dominion, should strive to improve and adorn the metropolis of his empire. It is the practice of despots to be lavish of expense on the royal residence and the seat of government. Travellers in France, as in other countries of the continent, are struck and pained by the contrast between the magnificent capital and the mud-walled village, and uninteresting province. Bonaparte had a special motive for decorating Paris, for 'Paris is France,' as has often been observed; and in conciliating the vanity of the great city, he secured the obedience of the whole country. The boasted internal improvements of Napoleon, scarcely deserve to be named, if we compare their influence with the operation of his public measures. The conscription, which drew from agriculture its most effective labourers, and his continental system, which sealed up every port and annihilated the commerce of his empire, drained and exhausted France to a degree, for which his artificial stimulants of industry, and his splendid projects afforded no compensation. Perhaps the most admired of all his public works, is the road over the Simplon, to which all travellers concur in giving the epithet, stupendous. But it ought not to amaze us, that he, who was aspiring at unlimited dominion, should establish communications between the different provinces of his empire. It ought not to amaze us, that he who had scaled the glaciers of St. Bernard, should covet some easier passage for pouring his troops into Italy; nor is it very wonderful, that a sovereign, who commanded the revenues of Europe, and who lived in an age when civil engineering had been advanced to a perfection before unknown, should accomplish a bolder enterprise than his predecessors. We would add, that Napoleon must divide with Fabbroni the glory of the road over the Simplon; for the genius which contrived and constructed, is more properly its author, than the will which commanded it.

"There is, however, one great work which gives Bonaparte a fair claim on the gratitude of posterity, and entitles him to an honourable renown. We refer to the new code of laws, which was given to France under his auspices. His participation in this work, has indeed been unwarrantably and ridiculously magnified. Because he attended the meetings of the commissioners to whom it was assigned, and made some useful and sagacious suggestions, he has been praised, as if he had struck out, by the miraculous force of his genius, a new code of laws. The truth is, that he employed for this work, as he should have done, the most eminent civilians of the empire; and it is also true that these learned men have little claim to originality; for, as our author observes, the code 'has few peculiarities making a difference betwixt its principles and those of the Roman law.' In other words, they preferred wisdom to novelty. Still Bonaparte deserves great praise for his interest in the work, for the impulse he gave to those to whom it was committed, and for the time and thought, which, amidst the cares of a vast empire, he

bestowed upon it. That his ambition incited him to this labour, we doubt not. He meant to entwine the laurels of Justinian with those of Alexander. But we will not quarrel with ambition, when it is wise enough to devote itself to the happiness of mankind. In the present case, he showed that he understood something of true glory; and we prize the instance more, because it stands almost alone in his history. We look on the conqueror, the usurper, the spoiler of kingdoms, the insatiable despot, with disgust, and see in all these characters an essential vulgarness of mind. But when we regard him as a Fountain of Justice to a vast empire, we recognise in him a resemblance to the just and benignant Deity, and cheerfully accord to him the praise of bestowing on a nation, one of the greatest gifts, and of the most important means of improvement and happiness, which it is permitted to man to confer. It was, however, the misery of Bonaparte, a curse brought on him by his crimes, that he could touch nothing without leaving on it the polluting mark of depotism. His usurpation took from him the power of legislating with magnanimity, where his own interest was concerned. He could provide for the administration of justice between man and man, but not between the citizen and the ruler. Political offences, the very class which ought to be submitted to a jury, were denied that mode of trial. Juries might decide on other criminal questions; but they were not to be permitted to interpose between the despot and the ill-fated subjects, who might fall under his suspicion. These were arraigned before 'special tribunals, invested with a half military character,' the ready ministers of nefarious prosecutions, and only intended to cloak by legal forms the murderous purpose of the tyrant.

"We have thus considered some of the means by which Bonaparte consolidated and extended his power. We now see him advanced to that imperial throne, on which he had long fixed his eager eye. We see France now awed and now dazzled by the influence we have described, and at last surrendering, by public, deliberate acts, without a struggle or a show of opposition, her rights, liberties, interests, and power, to an absolute master, and to his posterity for ever. Thus perished the name and forms of the Republic. Thus perished the hopes of philanthropy. The air, which a few years ago resounded with the shouts of a great people casting away their chains, and claiming their birthright of freedom, now rung with the servile cries of long life to a bloodstained usurper. There were indeed generous spirits, true patriots, like our own La Fayette, still left in France. But few and scattered, they were left to shed in secret the tears of sorrowful and indignant despair. By this base and disastrous issue of their revolution, the French nation not only renounced their own rights, but brought reproach on the cause of freedom, which years cannot wash away. This is to us a more painful recollection, than all the desolations which France spread through Europe, and than her own bitter sufferings, when the hour of retribution came upon her. The fields which she laid waste are again waving with harvest; and the groans which broke forth through her cities and villages, when her bravest sons perished by thousands and ten thousands on the snows of Russia, have died away, and her wasted population is renewed. But the wounds which she inflicted on freedom by the crimes perpetrated in that sacred name, and by the abject spirit with which that sacred cause was deserted, are still fresh and bleeding. France not only subjected herself to a tyrant, but what is worse, she has given tyranny every where new pleas and arguments, and emboldened it to preach openly, in the face of heaven, the impious doctrines of absolute power and unconditional submission.

"Napoleon was now Emperor of France; and a man unacquainted with human nature, would think that such an empire, whose bounds now extended to the Rhine, might have satisfied even an ambitious man.

But Bonaparte obeyed that law of progress, to which the highest minds are peculiarly subjected; and acquisition inflamed, instead of appeasing, the spirit of dominion. He had long proposed to himself the conquest of Europe—of the world; and the title of Emperor added intenseness to this purpose. Did we not fear, that by repetition we might impair the conviction which we are most anxious to impress, we would enlarge on the enormity of the guilt involved in the project of universal empire. Napoleon knew distinctly the price which he must pay for the eminence which he coveted. He knew that the path to it lay over wounded and slaughtered millions, over putrefying heaps of his fellow creatures, over ravaged fields, smoking ruins, pillaged cities. He knew that his steps would be followed by the groans of widowed mothers and famished orphans; of bereaved friendship and despairing love; and that in addition to this amount of misery, he would create an equal amount of crime, by multiplying indefinitely the instruments and participators of his rapine and fraud. He knew the price, and resolved to pay it. But we do not insist on a topic, which few, very few as yet, understand or feel. Turning then for the present from the moral aspect of this enterprise, we will view it in another light, which is of great importance to a just estimate of his claims on admiration. We will inquire into the nature and fitness of the measures and policy which he adopted for compassing the subjugation of Europe and the world.

We are aware, that this discussion may expose us to the charge of great presumption. It may be said, that men having no access to the secrets of cabinets, and no participation in public affairs, are not the best judges of the policy of such a man as Napoleon. This we are not anxious to disprove, nor shall we quarrel with our readers for questioning the soundness of our opinions. But we will say, that though distant, we have not been indifferent observers of the great events of our age, and that though conscious of exposure to many errors, we have a strong persuasion of the substantial correctness of our views. We express then, without reserve, our belief, that the policy of Napoleon was wanting in sagacity, and that he proved himself incapable, as we before suggested, of understanding the character and answering the demands of his age. His system was a repetition of old means, when the state of the world was new. The sword and the police, which had sufficed him for enslaving France, were not the only powers required for his designs against the human race. Other resources were to be discovered or created; and the genius for calling them forth, did not, we conceive, belong to Napoleon.

(To be Continued.)

The Unitarian Congregation of Glasgow, gratefully acknowledge donations towards the liquidation of their Chapel debt, from friends to Unitarianism in Aberdeen; and a collection by the Unitarian Society of Carluke.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 20. APRIL, 1828. Vol. II.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

IT is a prevailing practice of the *soi-disant* orthodox of the present day, to raise an outcry against every thing that savours of liberality in religious opinions, as if it were presumptuous and dangerous innovation. We find indeed, in every period of historical record, that those who have either a bad cause to support, or a selfish object to accomplish, have been careful, by assuming an air of mystery, to awe the penetrating scrutiny of reason, as if that heavenly faculty were bestowed by the wise and gracious Creator, as a vain and worthless and delusive gift. At the most, it would seem that they admit its efficacy merely as far as relates to temporal objects, but will allow it no importance or activity in ascertaining the dearest hopes of the human heart, in contemplating the wonders of Divine Benignity, or in promoting the purest felicity of the immortal soul. Yet, however priestly artifice and arrogance may have too frequently succeeded, in establishing their usurpations and cramping intellectual energy, it is most pleasing to perceive, that their influence has not been so general and overwhelming, as at any time totally to silence the voice of inquiry, or to immerse, in utter darkness, the light of divine truth. In periods of the gloomiest ignorance, under circumstances the most deterring that can be conceived, there have not been wanting minds of a nobler constitution, that have dared to defy the malignity of spiritual intolerance—to scorn the abomination of human authority presuming to dictate to the conscience—and bursting those shackles of bigotry, by which they had been hitherto confined, to exert their powers in contemplating the divine counsels, and in admiring the beautiful adaptation of the communications of Heaven, to the present condition and the future hopes of man. Truth, when sought after with discriminating judgment and independent principle, has ever shone with the same bright radiance. Its sincere and candid advocates, though unacquainted with one another, and possessing no means of mutual in-

tercourse, though widely separated by time and country, have yet, in the more important points, entertained a similarity of views and arrived at similar conclusions. Our assertion is strikingly illustrated, by looking to those distinguished luminaries, who now in regions the remotest from each other, stand forth as champions of the Christian cause, and maintain its genuine simplicity and purity, agreeably to the consistent and dignified views of the Unitarian believer. In reverting to the page of history, we are much gratified at perceiving many distinguished characters bearing ample testimony, likewise, to the same important observations. It is not, however, my present purpose to call the attention of your readers to the many admirable instances that might be adduced in support of the statement I have made. I have been led to offer these remarks, in consequence of my having lately had the opportunity of perusing in manuscript, a work on the much disputed doctrine of the Trinity, and which, it is expected, will shortly be issued from the London press. Among the many able works that have of late years appeared on that subject, the treatise in question will be found to possess a very considerable degree of merit. A work formed from collating and comparing every individual passage of Scripture, that could be conceived, either directly or indirectly, to have a reference to the one important point in question—the work, too, of a man in whom was strikingly manifested the triumph of truth and reason, over early and deeply rooted prejudice, can scarcely fail to be interesting and instructive to candid and well-regulated minds.

The Rev. John Cameron, the author of the treatise to which I allude, was a member of the General Synod of Ulster, and for many years minister of the Presbyterian congregation of Dunluce, in the northern part of the County Antrim. He was a native of Scotland, and was first introduced into public life, in Ireland, as a preacher among the Covenanters, or, as they are sometimes called, Cameronians; and bearing himself the name of Cameron, and addressing the almost immediate descendents of those, who, through persecution, had been forced to emigrate from Scotland, and had settled on the northern shores of Ireland, he was a deservedly popular minister of the day. He preached the doctrines of Calvin in their full rigour and austerity; nor did he attempt, as some moderns have

done, to fashion them to popular taste, and publish them in a moderated tone.

The eminent popularity of this sincere and zealous man, procured him a unanimous call from the Congregation of Dunluce, under the care of the Presbytery of Route: to which charge, after passing through the usual trials, he was shortly afterwards ordained. Intimately acquainted with systematic divinity, powerfully affecting in his language and address, with simple manners and unbending integrity, he fully realised the expectations of his friends, and stood in the foremost rank of respectable and eloquent preachers.

About this time, a most important revolution took place in his religious sentiments. This is best related in his own words: "I had been invited to dine with a dignitary of the Established Church, when after dinner, as both of us were men of literary inquiry, the Churchman said, 'Cameron, have you seen Taylor of Norwich on Original Sin?' No, was my reply, nor do I wish to see it, it is a most dangerous production, and I have often cautioned my flock against its new-fangled doctrines. 'I shall give it to you,' said the gentleman, 'when you are returning home.' On my retiring, the dignitary said, 'Cameron, you have forgot the book, but I shall bring it to you.' With great reluctance did I remain, until the book was put into my hand; and I declare, such was my aversion, that I would as soon have been accompanied home by his Satanic Majesty. Next morning, I commenced a perusal of this production. As I advanced, a new and wonderful light broke in upon my mind. The author's exposition of Scripture, and the illustration of the doctrine he proposed, was so exceedingly simple, rational, and consistent with the Word of God, that I never met with any thing that made such an impression on my mind. In a few days I laid the book aside, pondering and revolving in mind its important contents. I then resumed the perusal, carefully collating every text with the original, and comparing it with the Word of God. The result was, a complete and entire change in my religious sentiments. My former opinions and prejudices dissolved before the sun of truth, and disappeared as the morning dew before the rising orb of day."

From this may be dated that thorough investigation of the Word of God, which he then commenced, and which

appeared so conspicuous in all his writings. His cotemporaries, who frequently heard him preach, have declared, that in the exposition of the Word of God, they never heard any man who could give such happy and judicious illustrations. Lecturing, or explaining a portion of the Scriptures, being, in his day, a constituent part of public worship, he was singularly felicitous in that mode of public instruction.

As a writer of sermons, he was truly original, composing entirely from the stores of his own clear and comprehensive mind. And so freely did he abound in such productions, that he composed for several of his less able brethren in the ministry, who preached to rigidly Calvinistic congregations. Nor did he fashion and accommodate these sermons to the supposed popular taste. With that unbending integrity which distinguished him, he never deviated even here, from the purity of the faith he professed. And in moments of more unreserved communication, he has declared to his particular friends, that his discourses were preached in six congregations on every Sabbath-day, of several of which, the ministers dare not be known to correspond with him, so exceedingly obnoxious was he to the Calvinistic party, at least dare not venture to hold with him any ecclesiastical communion.

In his public appearance as a minister of the Gospel, Mr. Cameron was singularly impressive. His lofty tone of expression, his energetic mode of address, the fluency and fervour of his language, the usual accompaniment of original conception, and the powerful sensibility with which he seemed to feel, when treating of matters peculiarly interesting and pathetic, rendered him a speaker whom few could hear without profound attention and irresistible emotion. Hence, he was greatly admired as a preacher, even by those who disapproved of his religious sentiments.

In his habits and manners, he was altogether primitive and simple, being studious in the extreme, and seldom, if ever, entering on the cares and concerns of the world. His circumstances, of course, were very limited. Yet the good providence of God never suffered him to be in absolute want; and there are many instances on record, which, while they bear testimony to his pure and estimable character, bespeak the truest feelings of Christian love on the part of his benefactors. To their disinterested

kindness he was chiefly indebted for those supplies of the comforts of life, which, in the ardour of his search after truth, and with which he discharged his ministerial duties, he had been altogether heedless of providing. It was not till shortly before his death, that he learned who his benefactors were, and then, no words can describe the glow of virtuous feeling, the heartfelt sensibility of gratitude that vibrated through his whole frame: it almost paralysed him; nor was it till relieved by a flood of tears, that he could give utterance to his overwhelming emotions.

In this manner did this primitive servant of God pass a long life, happy in the approbation of the wise and good, fearlessly preaching the genuine truth of religion, and exemplifying it in a spotless life and character. He died on the last day of December, in the year 1799, having been for forty-five years minister of the Presbyterian congregation of Dunluce.

Mr. Cameron was the author of several works of generally acknowledged merit, displaying at once a sound judgment, profound literary information, and a free and independent mind. It was shortly after the remarkable change in his religious sentiments, when a bitter temper of disputation had arisen in the Synod about subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith, that, in the hope of allaying so unchristian a feeling, he published a pamphlet, entitled *The Catholic Christian.* This work, at the time, excited much attention, and was replied to by Mr. M'Dowel, then of Ballykelly, afterwards of Dublin. The result of the contest to the two gentlemen, was very different. For his defence of unconditional subscription, the one was rewarded with the title of Doctor of Divinity, while the abler man, the simple minister of Dunluce, was passed unnoticed and neglected. The next work which came from his pen, was The *Messiah.* Then followed another small volume, called *Scripture Forms of Devotion,* a work composed entirely in the language of Scripture. Another work on which he bestowed much pains, was *The State of our First Parents in the Garden of Eden, impartially considered and compared with that of their posterity in the world.* Besides these, he composed several others on subjects of most important interest, and which are said to have been truly admirable, but which from peculiar circumstances, particularly in the author's worldly concerns, never reached publicity. Of the number of these,

is his treatise on the doctrine of the Trinity, now shortly expected to make its first public appearance, and which, from the excitement that prevails at the present day respecting that much contested point, as well as from the internal evidence it bears of profound research and candid discrimination, will, it is presumed, be found to merit an attentive and dispassionate perusal.

CLERICUS.

Renunciation of 1 *John* v. 7.

MANY of our readers are probably aware of the very decisive language in which the Eclectic Review, some years since, rejected as spurious, the text above mentioned. We have now to add the disclaimer of another orthodox periodical, the Congregational Magazine. In a review of a work under the signature of Crito Cantabrigiensis, and commonly assigned to Dr. Turton, the recently appointed Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, the following observations occur:—"Since the ample discussions which, within the last fifty years, have been given to the disputed passage which forms a part of the 7th and 8th verses of the first Epistle of John, it would not have been an unreasonable assumption, that no man of competent information would have farther doubt of the spuriousness of that passage." After accounting for the introduction of the passage into the Sacred Scriptures, which is done by supposing the spurious words to have been a commentary on the adjoining text, placed, about the 4th century, in the margin of a MS. and subsequently transferred into the body of the Epistle, the reviewer adds, "By a weight of evidence, which it is no exaggeration to call a moral demonstration, it has of late years been generally rejected by those who have taken the pains of making themselves acquainted with the subject. We sincerely hope," he continues, "that an end will be put to the dregs of this controversy, by the wise, temperate, and powerful work before us. That the bishop of Salisbury should be convinced, is what we are far from expecting; but we cannot doubt that any other intelligent and upright reader will be so."

On Truth: a Fragment.

I.

How bright the sun bursts from the orient wave!
How doth its light, careering, mount the sky,
And with a flood of mystic splendour, lave
Earth's unsearch'd, broad, and burning canopy!
How doth each fleecy cloud, to gifted eye,
Float like an airy islet of the bless'd!
Till strains seraphic, stealing from on high,
Sweetly the spirit woo, with grief oppress'd,
By faith to realize its covenanted rest.

II.

How doth the rising orb, with radiate fold,
Veil each bright form below! Each hoary steep,
With purple robe, and diadem of gold,
Sits on its mighty throne! The eternal deep
Smiles with the raptur'd glow, o'er which we weep
When bending o'er the dead; the forests wave
One glittering sea of light! The torrents leap
From crag to crag; and, with translucent tide, lave
Each opposing barrier; then seek unfathom'd grave.

III.

Night lifts her mantle grey, then flinging back
One scowling glance of hate, shrinks from the power
Of day. With form immense, shadowy, and black,
Glides slowly from the world. Then opens every flower
Its dewy valves—rings every forest bower
With shrill-toned melody;—the enamell'd earth,
And azure wave—lake, glen, tree, rock, and tower,
And childhood's innocent, unprompted mirth,
With one united hail! welcome the glorious birth.

IV.

So bursts invigorate, from the womb of Time,
The light of *Truth!* So its refulgent beams,
Scattering the clouds of error, ascending, climb
The horizon of the mind;—so richly teems
The moral world beneath its genial gleams.
The mists of Superstition, touch'd by its power,
Dissolve—nor frenzied imagery the dreams
Of zealots yield, which o'er the reason lower,
Pollute the fount of joy—the milk of kindness sour.

* * * * * * * *

What! shall the *mind*, through *fear*, its play restrain?
Barter for brute-like apathy, its birth-right
Thought? Its free ethereal essence stain,
For leave to crawl beneath the chilling night
Of Tyranny? Oh! shall its burning light,
Be stretch'd on some *Procrustes* bed of *soul*?
And all its solemn breathings, pure and bright,
Be measured by the miserable dole
Of spiritual might, beneath a Churchman's stole?

Go, view the captive's cell, (the dungeon's *gloom*
Sheds *light for this*,) how doth this mortal clay
Pine 'neath the thraldom of a living tomb,
And 'scape its fetters by a quick decay!
What! shall the *body* wither, when a stay
Is laid upon its movement; and the *mind*,
With all its dazzling energies, essay
To train its flight by nature *unconfin'd*,
To sweep the vault of *Shame*, where sun of *Truth* ne'er shined?

Ye shades of martyr'd saints! who did prefer
A gory bed, beneath the mountain sod,
To life inglorious—could aught deter
Ye from the *open* worship of your God,
In forms by conscience sanction'd? Did the rod
Of Persecution—heavy though it fell—
Teach you to cringe beneath a despot's nod?
And, for the *privilege of slaves*, to sell
That *right*, which, of itself, would make a Heaven of Hell?

* * * * * * * *

Scotia! how dear to me, it were, to climb
Once more, thy craggy hills, with summits bare,
And gaze on scenes hallow'd in olden time,
By stern and solemn deeds, wrought out so nobly there.
Then, would the carbine flash, the sabre glare,
The heath its purple change for dye of red,
And shouts of Zion's triumph rend the air;
Then, would the lone hills yield their honour'd dead,
The spot by martyrs trod, re-echo to their tread!

Sons of the *mighty dead!* Oh! can it be,
Ye seal your hearts to lessons to you taught
In characters of *blood*? What made ye free?
What struck the fetters from expansive thought?
The enduring constancy with which they wrought
The work of *liberty!* and left a page
In annals of the Church, which, fearless sought
With reverent *love of Truth*, must *you* engage
To rise the emancipators of a *future* age!

Universal Restoration.

Moore the Poet, in his last published and interesting work, entitled the Epicurean, has the following note on the grand doctrine of Universal Salvation:

"This benevolent doctrine—which not only goes far to solve the great problem of moral and physical evil, but which would, if received generally, tend to soften the spirit of uncharitableness, so fatally prevalent among Christian sects—was maintained by that great light of the early Church, Origen, and has not wanted supporters among more modern theologians. That Tillotson was inclined to the opinion, appears from his sermon preached before the Queen. Paley is supposed to have held the same amiable doctrine; and Newton, the author of the work on the prophecies, is also among the supporters of it. For a full account of the arguments in favour of this opinion, derived both from reason and the express language of Scripture, see Dr. Southwood Smith's very interesting work "on the Divine Government." See also Magee on the Atonement, where the doctrine of the advocates of Universal Restoration is thus briefly and fairly explained: 'Beginning with the existence of an infinitely powerful, wise, and good Being, as the first and fundamental principle of rational religion, they pronounce the essence of this Being to be *love*, and from this infer, as a demonstrable consequence, that none of the creatures formed by such a Being, will ever be made eternally miserable, since God, they say, would act unjustly in inflicting eternal misery for temporary crimes; the sufferings of the wicked can be but remedial, and will terminate in a complete purification from moral disorder, and in their ultimate restoration to virtue and happiness.'"

A New-Year's-Day Discourse.

(Continued from page 246.)

The first observation that suggests itself, is the urgent necessity that exists, that we should seize the present moment, as the commencement of a determined and persevering endeavour to emancipate ourselves from the bondage of any sinful habit, by the power of which we may be enslaved. The formation of *habit*, is the frequent recurrence of certain acts, *united together* by a particular tendency or desire, strengthened by indulgence; and it is this influence which one act of indulgence exerts over the mind, *prompting to a repetition* of a similar act. It is this *connection* that exists between the several *divided acts*—this almost *moral necessity*—that a *frequently gratified propensity* should be followed, by a *recurring indulgence*, that invests habit, when sinful, with its most appalling characteristic—its *despotic controlment*. Were every desire, and every train of thought, and every volition, and every action, an unassociated one—unconnected by the laws of causation, to a previous or subsequent indulgence, then should we, in the lack of self-discipline, be removed from the field of our most arduous duties, and most obstinate conflicts—then should we be enabled to put forth a more efficient power in the act of quelling the rebellious movements of our hearts—then should we be enabled to discipline our will to a more entire subjection, and yielding of itself up with a more generous and absolute devotement, to the requirements of the Gospel—then should we be enabled to free ourselves, with a more effectual weaning, from the clinging and grasping hinderances of worldly-mindedness—then should we be enabled to send forth the cry of a most resolute and determined defiance to the menacing attitudes of the fleshly appetites—then should we be enabled to exert a more refining influence upon the stubborn coating of the mind, and clear away the heavy and polluting fumes of spiritual pride and uncharitableness—then should we be enabled to prosecute a mightier crusade against the tumultuary outbreakings of unbridled passion, that quench the spirit, and separate between ourselves and our Creator! It is the concentrated energy of many previous successes, that invests the adversary, in the hour of trial, with his most imposing array, and his most efficient power. It is the debased tone that the

moral feeling has imbibed from former imbecility and inefficient resistance, that prevents the heart from responding in harmonious numbers, to the fine touch of native sensibility. It is the yielding and capricious barrier opposed to sinful indulgence in its rise, that, instead of resisting, only chafes and lashes up the stream to frenzy—that impels the passions to so fierce a round of desolation, and a usurpation so tyrannous and biting.

Now, as sin obtains over us its hold and ascendancy, through the influence of a *succession of indulgences*, so is it eradicated by a like *succession of resistances*. It is not to be disenthroned from its supremacy by any *one act* of the will. It is not to be intimidated by the loud, obstreperous outcry of a single impetuous and indignant note of defiance. The heart is not to be purged of its alloy, by an act of heated and impassioned zeal, thrown out from the dying embers of exhausted passion. The criminal inclination, that has strengthened with the strength, and grown with the growth, is not to be brow-beaten by the querulous complainings of remorse—raising her voice of anguish, in the languid interval of gratified indulgence. Oh, no!—The casting off the slough of defilement, must be, the working of a slow and continued course of self-discipline; it must be the result of a long and arduous struggle, maintained with determined fortitude, and supported by spiritual influences. It requires the peculiar agency of an entire regenerative process—bringing the proud will into subjection to the teaching of the Gospel, and raising the tendency of the desires, from the things which are seen and temporal, to those which are unseen and eternal! It needs, that the perishable vanities of the creature should be removed from all the avenues of the heart, and that the Creator should be the one prominent object of contemplation. It calls for the sacrifice of worldly mindedness, and worldly tastes, and worldly affections, upon the altar of Christian obedience. It demands that the soul should be brought in patient waiting and submissive confidence, and with the humility of a little child, to sit at the feet of Jesus, and look for all its enjoyments, and all its elevations, and all its rapturous excitements, from the feeling conviction of having yielded up all its perversities, and all its carnal appetites, and all its inordinate cravings, in entire devotion to his teachings and his requirements; and above all, that the spirit should be trained to earnest, habitual, and un-

wearied prayer; that it should, at all times, and in all seasons, seek guidance, and direction, and assistance, and refreshment, from above, in the fervent breathings of humble and contrite supplication; that the homage which we render to the Creator, should not be confined to the periodical returns of stated and formal observance, but the spirit of devotion and ardent piety should be infused into the every occupation of our day—entering into our every thought, and our every contemplation, and our every desire—purifying our affections in their every movement —exalting our imagination in its every conception. You will be ready to exclaim, that this is of difficult accomplishment, arduous in its undertaking, and unpromising in its aspect. My Christian friends, I will not deceive you, it is an arduous undertaking—it is of difficult accomplishment. It requires the exercise of a most trying faith—of a most resolute self-denial—of a most heart-sifting mortification. But it is not of impossible attainment. No: blessed be God! It is not without the sphere of our appropriation. It is not raised beyond the grasp of our endeavour. It is not beyond the influence of an attractive faith. What then should be the determination of our souls? What the resolve of our understandings? Shall we shrink in pusillanimous dismay before so high-minded an achievement? Shall we recoil from the ennobling warfare, and hug the chains that gall us? Shall we relapse into heartless indifference, and enervating indolence, and stony obduracy, till we hear the fearful cry, "Behold the bridegroom cometh?" Or, shall we not rather determine with promptitude, to cast from us the sin that doth most easily beset us, and execute with vigour our holy purposes of amendment? Shall we not banish indecision from our minds, and disdain every compromise with our unrighteousness, and incline us to the mark of our high-calling with undeviating constancy, in defiance of any opposition that may discourage, or any obstacle that may impede our progress? Shall we not, as "wise men that discern both time and judgment," "awake from our sleep, and arise from the dead," confiding in the gracious promise of the Apostle, that "Christ shall give us light?"

The next method I shall offer for your consideration, for improving the passing time, viewed in relation to judgment, is the acquiring the habit of habitual watchfulness over the processes of our hearts and understandings.

Since the manifold attractions of the world, and the perishable vanities of time, are entering by the every avenue to our souls—if we would live unspotted from the world, the necessity is urgent upon us, that we keep a vigilant and mistrustful eye upon the nature of the reception their claimants meet with from our affections, and the influence that they exert over our wills. The first rising of sinful inclination, is the foe that we are called upon to grapple with and subdue. We should rather seek, at closing the gate of our hearts to the admission of danger, than run the risk, by a criminal negligence, of having a rebellious outcry circulated throughout the camp. The beginnings of evil are often in their character so insignificant and so apparently inadequate to the production of any serious and alarming mischief, that, too often, they are removed from under the eye of a very observant regard; but experience fatally verifies the insidious nature of corruption, and should prevent us from considering the smallest inroad of impurity, as being too insignificant to have a claim upon our moral vigilance, or too contemptible to call forth the application of an immediate antidote. If, then, we are desirous of preserving our innocence, in the freshness of unspotted infancy—if we are solicitous of protecting our integrity from being shaken from its hold over our conduct—if we are striving earnestly to fortify ourselves impregnably in uprightness and moral principle—if we are seeking to keep the "temple of God, which temple are ye, holy and undefiled,"—it must be effected, not by waiting till the enemy have concentrated their forces, and made a lodgment in the citadel of our affections—not by disdaining the conflict, under the mistaken idea that no honour is to be acquired by subduing the rebellious movement in its infancy—not by underrating the magnitude of the evil, till it threaten to bury us in its ruins.

The mountain that now reposes in sombre and tranquil majesty, all its cliffs, and caves, and rocks, with their thousand echoes slumbering in silence, girdled with abundance and vegetable splendour, and glowing beneath the effulgence of the noon-day sun, as though it were the spot on which he delighted to repose his diadem of glory—may, ere the twinkling of an eye, emit from her womb thunder and fire, volumed smoke, and midnight gloom, enveloping earth, sea, and sky, in the blackness of darkness, divided by the blood-red stream of boiling lava,

playing like a fountain on the mountain's side, in its passage of desolation—converting the blooming fertility of a garden, into the sterility of a scorched-up and calcined wilderness. Oh! no: We are called upon to wrestle with the first rising of the obdurate and rebellious will. We are called upon to tread out the first spark that kindles in the storehouse of our affections. We must strangle the Hercules in his cradle, or like a blind giant, he will stalk over the empire of our hearts, trampling upon the promise of all that is bright, and encouraging, and cheering, in the moral aspect of our lives—withering the bloom of our kindest, and purest, and most exalted sensibilities—and crushing out the fruits ripe for the harvest, that we had nurtured with so assiduous a guardianship, and superintended with so anxious and patient a solicitude.

(To be Continued.)

Matthew the Evangelist, a Unitarian.

[From "The Unitarian," a periodical, recently commenced in New-York, by the Rev. William Ware, the respected Minister of the First Unitarian Church in that City. Two excellent Numbers of "The Unitarian" have been published.—*Edit.*]

The title to this article has not been assumed for its singularity, but because it expresses a most solemn and important truth. If his own words, as the professed historian of our Lord, are to be taken in evidence, then was Matthew a Unitarian; then is his Gospel strictly Unitarian; and its doctrine is—there is but one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ. If his own statements, and the whole tenor of his Gospel are to be taken in evidence, then is it equally certain, that he has not taught the doctrine of the Trinity, or that of the Deity of Jesus Christ; and, therefore, never heard of them from the mouth of his Divine Master, nor did ever believe them. These things, it appears to me, may be established by arguments sufficiently conclusive to satisfy the mind of an honest, impartial inquirer.

I shall endeavour to establish my position, first, by some general observations bearing on the subject, then by an examination of those passages which have been thought to teach the doctrine of the Trinity; and, lastly, by bring-

ing forward all that evidence of a positive nature, in favour of the strict of Unity of God, which the Gospel presents. And in doing this, I shall be as brief as the subject will allow.

I. I would remark, in the first place, that as the doctrine of the Trinity is confessedly one not to have been antecedently expected, at which, as an Orthodox writer has himself observed, "reason stands aghast, and faith herself is half confounded," it is right to expect, and demand, before receiving it is an article of belief, evidence that shall bear some proportion to its apparent intrinsic incredibility. It is not enough that such a doctrine be darkly hinted at, obscurely implied, doubtfully expressed. If man deals justly by himself, and acts with due reverence to God and his own reason, he will not feel himself justified in embracing such a truth, without the clearest and most ample testimony; like that, for example, on the strength of which, he believes in the divine authority of Jesus, in a future life, and a state of retribution. But such testimony, it cannot be pretended that the Bible itself, much less the Gospel of Matthew, does any where furnish. There is nothing distinct, clear, definite, on the subject. Not a single verse in the whole Bible lays down the doctrine in terms. It is a thing of remote, dark, uncertain *inference.*

It is here worthy to be remarked, that in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, and many other supposed doctrines of revelation, the common principles of evidence have been totally reversed. For, while on other subjects, it is a universal principle for the conduct of the understanding, that in proportion to the apparent intrinsic incredibility and improbability of a fact or proposition, must be the force, clearness, and abundance of the evidence which is brought to establish it—in religion, men have eagerly received, and implicitly believed doctrines, against which there was a strong previous presumption that they could not be true, doctrines of the most momentous import if true—on a show of evidence the least that can be supposed possible in a case of the kind, and which, in other matters, would be rejected as wholly inadequate, or as warranting only the lowest degree of assent. That which is seemingly impossible, and on the face of the thing incredible or highly improbable, we reasonably require to be substantiated by a proportional ful-

ness and distinctness of testimony; while that which is in accordance with other known facts, and other received knowledge, is in itself highly probable and likely to be true, we admit on a lesser weight of evidence. These just and obvious principles have, I repeat, in religious things been abandoned, if not reversed. Evidence which, in a court of human justice, neither judge, nor lawyer, nor jury, would take as competent testimony to a fact of even ordinary occurrence and character, or to a point of law—only change the ground to that of controversial divinity, and it becomes with these same persons most ample and decisive, to establish doctrines in themselves the most extraordinary, and most unlikely to be true. In religion, men have been ever ready to believe any thing and every thing, with or without evidence, as the case might be. It has seemed as if they took a strange delight in doing violence to the dictates of reason and common sense, and imagined themselves devout and meritorious before Heaven, in proportion to the easy credulity with which the most monstrous and revolting dogmas were engrafted into their creed. There has been nothing so essentially absurd, so obviously fabricated and false, that multitudes have not in every age of the Church been found to believe it as a part of the revelation of God, at the mandate of a priest, a pope, or a council. Evidence has not been asked for. It has rather been despised. Has it the authority of orthodox fathers? does it revolt reason and sense? does it task faith to the uttermost? these have virtually been the preliminary inquiries. Hence, it has happened that doctrines of a purely pagan or human origin, have been handed down from age to age, from church to church, and are unhesitatingly received at the present time, throughout all Christendom as vital truths of the Gospel, without even a decent show of evidence in their behalf, and so far, indeed, as Scripture is concerned, without being so much as named in it. Of this description, I apprehend, is the doctrine of the Trinity. Though so deep and high a mystery, so difficult to comprehend, so impossible to explain and teach, so little to have been looked for in a revelation, and, therefore, so natural and necessary to have been distinctly stated, and often repeated—this doctrine, has St. Mathew, as it seems to me, wholly overlooked, and, as I hope will appear in the sequel, closed his Gospel not only without furnishing that proof which the mind ought to demand in

the case, but without so much as naming it; nay, without having by chance written but one* sentence, which, when the doctrine has been otherwise established, can be tortured so as to favour it. Now, I put it to the conscience of every reflecting person, if it be credible that the Evangelist could have left such a doctrine in such uncertainty, in *any* uncertainty? Is it credible, that in writing an account of a religion which contained a doctrine like that of the Trinity—one which every dictate of reason assured him would meet with the bitterest opposition, would be received by the intelligent only on the amplest evidence, which he felt at the same time to be the crowning doctrine of the new faith—is it credible, that he should have left it to be doubtfully gathered from a few dark and equivocal expressions, which will bear, and on every just principle of criticism require, an interpretation fatal to the truth he intended to teach?

II. I remark, in the next place, that in taking the evidence of Matthew to the doctrine of the Trinity, we are to remember that he was once a Jew, and would have written with the feelings of one who had been so, and therefore if he had believed the doctrine himself, he would have given it a prominent place in his Gospel.

As a Jew, the most cherished article of his faith had been the strict unity of God. It was the distinctive feature of his ancient belief. It was that which gave to it its superiority to the surrounding polytheism. The Heathens had as imposing ceremonies—as splendid temples as the Jews; but they did not know and worship the ONE God. This was the exclusive glory of Judaism. This tenet was guarded with most especial jealousy. Idolatry—the having and worshipping more Gods than one—was with the

---

* Mat. xxviii. 19.—"Baptising them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." But who that had not elsewhere learned the doctrine of the Trinity, would ever, by the utmost stretch of the inventive power, construct out of this the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, "there are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory." How should one uninstructed in orthodoxy guess, in the first place, that God's Holy Spirit was a person, and not an influence? 2, That he was a person equal to God? 3, That the Son was not the Messiah simply, but a divine person, equal also to the Father? 4, That these three infinite Gods were not three Gods, but only one? The verse does not even hint at these things. I am borne out fully, I conceive, in the assertion that the only verse in the Gospel, which it is contended contains an allusion to the Trinity, is tortured in order to yield it.

Jews the unpardonable sin. The devoted attachment of the Jews to the strict unity of God, stands out more prominently than any other feature in the character of that people. And yet, notwithstanding the plain language of the Old Testament on this subject, men can be found, theologians, too, to maintain that the Trinity was a doctrine of the Jewish Church! But the opinion is too void of even a semblance of honesty, or fairness, or, shall I say, of common sense, to deserve any other notice than that of silence. I will only say, that the man who, after reading or studying the Old Testament, could rise from his labour with a conviction that the Trinity was taught or implied in it, is to be as much regarded as he who should affirm, after a similar inquiry, that Judaism was a system of Atheism. The Jew of the present day, as did the Jew of former days, believes God to be one, without division or distinction in name or nature, and now as ever, regards that as the most vital blow at his faith, which invades the purity and integrity of this primary article of his creed; and so far, is he more of a Christian than the believer in the Trinity.

With these feelings, and with such a belief, did Matthew join himself to our Lord. From him, says orthodoxy, as the first and most important lesson, did he receive an account of the mystery of the Trinity. Through his public preaching and private instruction, he must have heard this amazing doctrine often explained and enforced. He must have heard it laid down as the corner-stone of the new religion; for, if it made a part of it at all, Trinitarians are right in saying, that it formed and still forms its most distinguishing feature. He must have regarded it in that light himself. Its novelty and awful nature, its direct opposition to that great truth which he had been accustomed to venerate, the Divine Unity, must have deeply impressed his mind. When sent forth by our Saviour as a preacher of the Gospel, it must very often have formed the subject of his discourse, especially as he was addressing *Jews*, who would need to have it distinctly stated and argued, since, at first sight, it would seem to them but an ingenious covert system of polytheism. After our Lord's resurrection, when he became one of the great heralds of the new faith, he must have continued to preach and enforce it to the day of his death. He is commonly supposed to have written his Gospel in the year 65. He had, of course,

preached the religion which he afterward recorded, for the space of more than thirty years after his Master's death. During this long interval, must he not have become perfectly familiar with the leading truths of the faith he had been disseminating? Must not the vital and essential truths of that faith have been ten thousand times iterated from the house-top and by the way-side? Would not, I may confidently ask, these vital and essential truths be the first to present themselves to his mind, when sitting down to write an account of the religion which he had so long preached? Would he not, on principles of human nature, have given them the same prominence as a Trinitarian now would, who should sit down to write an account of Christianity? And what truths would a Trinitarian select, and what prominence would he give them? Would they not be, the most holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the double nature, the Deity of the Spirit? And would they not stand out in bold relief on every page, and be proclaimed as the truths, without faith in which there could be no salvation? If the Trinitarian would have written thus, had he been Matthew who can doubt he would have done so? Matthew, with *his* faith, would, it is morally certain, have done the same thing; he could not have written otherwise; he *must have written as he believed.* But, he has given these dogmas no such prominence. Their names do not catch the eye as it passes over his pages; their sound does not fall upon the ear as those pages are read. Where, I ask, and call for an answer, where are the marks of Matthew's Trinitarian faith? Open his Gospel, and search chapter after chapter, scan every verse and word, and where do you find the slightest trace of his belief in such a tenet? You will say, perhaps, it is *implied* in the form of baptism. Allowing it to be *there;* where else? No WHERE. You will, indeed, cull out two or three verses besides, in which you will maintain, that divine attributes are ascribed to Jesus, and that, therefore, he must be God; and, therefore, there is a Trinity! But—not to find fault with the remarkably excursive nature of this logic—beside these, where else in the whole Gospel do you find indications of the Evangelist's faith in the Supreme Deity of Jesus, or the doctrine of the Trinity? I will not taunt with the question, where does he mention the name of this essential dogma—where does he speak of the *thing* for which the name stands? Is it not but too

plain, that, although a few texts may be construed so as to favour the Trinitarian hypothesis—is it not plain, that their value, whatever it may be thought to be, is wholly destroyed when we consider the *general tenor and prevailing language* of the Gospel; that with every reason why the Evangelist should give the doctrine in question, a distinct prominence above all other truths, he has, on the contrary, kept it strangely out of sight? A few texts like those on which the advocate of the Trinity relies, ought not to be considered as of any authority by an unprejudiced mind, on a question like this. They are, in truth, of no force whatever. Such a doctrine must be able to show a better support, or it can, with the intelligent mind, never be thought worthy to be believed. I should think myself as well warranted in saying, that the author of a treatise on the Newtonian system, was, nevertheless, a disciple of Des Cartes, because there were one or two statements which I could explain in consistency with his theory, though opposed by the whole scope and tenor of the book, as that the doctrine of the Trinity is to be found in the Gospel of Matthew, and was believed by him, though the whole tenor and prevailing language of the history rejects, and denies, and disowns it, because there are a few passages which will *bear* a Trinitarian exposition.

Is it credible, now, I would ask, that Matthew, once a Jew and a firm believer in the Unity of God, should have sat down and written a history of his new faith, so opposite on so essential a point to his old belief, without once giving his reader to understand, by a single clear statement, that his new faith was different from his old one? Is it credible, that being a Christian, with a Christian's faith in the tri-personality of the Deity, he should have written on the subject like a Jew? Is it credible, that the Apostle, writing under such circumstances, should have left it a doubtful point, whether on the subject of the mode of God's existence, and the person of Jesus Christ, he was not still a Jew? Is it credible, that he should write an express history of Jesus and his religion, and never, in one clear, unambiguous sentence, tell the amazing truth, that Jesus, who to all outward appearance was a man, was not so in reality, but the Almighty and Omnipresent God?

(To be Continued.)

"*Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, occasioned by the publication of Scott's Life of Napoleon.*"

(Continued from page 252.)

"THE circumstances under which Napoleon aspired to universal empire, differed in many respects from those under which former conquerors were placed. It was easy for Rome, when she had subdued kingdoms, to reduce them to provinces, and to govern them by force; for nations at that period were bound together by no tie. They had little communication with each other. Differences of origin, of religion, of manners, of language, of modes of warfare; differences aggravated by long and ferocious wars, and by the general want of civilization, prevented joint action, and almost all concern for one another's fate. Modern Europe, on the other hand, was an assemblage of civilized states, closely connected by commerce, by literature, by a common faith, by interchange of thoughts and improvements, and by a policy which had for ages proposed, as its chief object, the establishment of such a balance of power as would secure national independence. Under these influences the human mind had made great progress; and in truth, the French revolution had resulted from an unprecedented excitement and developement of men's faculties, and from the extension of power and intelligence through a vastly wider class, than had participated in them at any former period. The very power which Napoleon was wielding, might be traced to an enthusiasm essentially generous, and manifesting a tendency of the civilized world to better institutions. It is plain, that the old plans of conquest, and the maxims of comparatively barbarous ages, did not suit such a state of society. An ambitious man was to make his way, by allying himself with the new movements and excitements of the world. The existence of a vast maritime power like England, which, by its command of the ocean, and its extensive commerce, was brought into contact with every community, and which, at the same time, enjoyed the enviable pre-eminence of possessing the freest institutions in Europe, was of itself a sufficient motive for a great modification of the policy, by which one state was now to be placed at the head of the nations. The peculiar character and influence of England, Bonaparte seemed indeed never able to comprehend; and the violent measures, by which he essayed to tear asunder the old connections of that country with the continent, only gave them strength, by adding to the ties of interest those of sympathy, of common suffering, and common danger.

"Force and corruption were the great engines of Napoleon, and he plied them without disguise or reserve, not caring how far he insulted, and armed against himself, the moral and national feelings of Europe. His great reliance was on the military spirit and energy of the French people. To make France a nation of soldiers, was the first and main instrument of his policy; and here he was successful. The revolution, indeed, had in no small degree done this work to his hands. To complete it, he introduced a

national system of education, having for its plain end to train the whole youth of France to a military life, to familiarize the mind to this destination from its earliest years, and to associate the idea of glory almost exclusively with arms. The conscription gave full efficacy to this system; for as every young man in the empire had reason to anticipate a summons to the army, the first object in education, naturally was, to fit him for the field. The public honours bestowed on military talent, and a rigorous impartiality in awarding promotion to merit, so that no origin, however obscure, was a bar to what were deemed the highest honours of Europe, kindled the ambition of the whole people into a flame, and directed it exclusively to the camp. It is true, the conscription, which thinned so terribly the ranks of her youth, and spread anxiety and bereavement through all her dwellings, was severely felt in France. But Napoleon knew the race whom it was his business to manage; and by the glare of victory, and the title of the Grand Empire, he succeeded in reconciling them for a time to the most painful domestic privations, and to an unexampled waste of life. Thus he secured, what he accounted the most important instrument of dominion, a great military force. But, on the other hand, the stimulants, which, for this purpose, he was forced to apply perpetually to French vanity, the ostentation with which the invincible power of France was trumpeted to the world, and the haughty vaunting style which became the most striking characteristic of that intoxicated people, were perpetual irritations of the national spirit and pride of Europe, and implanted a deep hatred towards the new and insulting empire, which waited but for a favourable moment to repay with interest the debt of humiliation.

"The condition of Europe forbade, as we believe, the establishment of universal monarchy by mere physical force. The sword, however important, was now to play but a secondary part. The true course for Napoleon seems to us to have been indicated, not only by the state of Europe, but by the means which France in the beginning of her revolution had found most effectual. He should have identified himself with some great interests, opinion, or institutions, by which he might have bound to himself a large party in every nation. He should have contrived to make at least a specious cause against all old establishments. To contrast himself most strikingly and most advantageously with former governments, should have been the key of his policy. He should have placed himself at the head of a new order of things, which should have worn the face of an improvement of the social state. Nor did the subversion of republican forms prevent his adoption of this course, or of some other which would have secured to him the sympathy of multitudes. He might still have drawn some broad lines between his own administration and that of other states, tending to throw the old dynasties into the shade. He might have cast away all the pageantry and forms of courts, distinguished himself by the simplicity of his establishments, and exaggerated the relief which he gave to his people, by saving them the burdens of a wasteful and luxurious court. He might have

insisted on the great benefits that had accrued to France from the establishment of uniform laws, which protected alike all classes of men; and he might have virtually pledged himself to the subversion of the feudal inequalities which still disfigured Europe. He might have insisted on the favourable changes to be introduced into property, by abolishing the entails which fettered it, the rights of primogeniture, and the exclusive privileges of a haughty aristocracy. He might have found abuses enough against which to array himself as a champion. By becoming the head of new institutions, which would have involved the transfer of power into new hands, and would have offered to the people a real improvement, he might every where have summoned to his standard the bold and enterprising, and might have disarmed the national prejudices to which he fell a prey. Revolution was still the true instrument of power. In a word, Napoleon lived at a period, when he could only establish a durable and universal control, through principles and institutions of some kind or other, to which he would seem to be devoted.

"It was impossible, however, for such a man as Napoleon, to adopt, perhaps to conceive, a system such as has now been traced; for it was wholly at war with that egotistical, self-relying, self-exaggerating principle, which was the most striking feature of his mind. He imagined himself able, not only to conquer nations, but to hold them together by the awe and admiration which his own character would inspire; and this bond he preferred to every other. An indirect sway, a control of nations by means of institutions, principles, or prejudices, of which he was to be only the apostle and defender, was utterly inconsistent with that vehemence of will, that passion for astonishing mankind, and that persuasion of his own invincibleness, which were his master feelings, and which made force his darling instrument of dominion. He chose to be the great, palpable, and sole bond of his empire; to have his image reflected from every establishment; to be the centre, in which every ray of glory should meet, and from which every impulse should be propagated. In consequence of this egotism, he never dreamed of adapting himself to the moral condition of the world. The sword was his chosen weapon, and he used it without disguise. He insulted nations as well as sovereigns. He did not attempt to gild their chains, or to fit the yoke gently to their necks. The excess of his extortions, the audacity of his claims, and the insolent language in which Europe was spoken of as the vassal of the great empire, discovered, that he expected to reign, not only without linking himself with the interests, prejudices, and national feelings of men, but by setting all at defiance.

"It would be easy to point out a multitude of instances, in which he sacrificed the only policy by which he could prevail, to the persuasion, that his own greatness could more than balance whatever opposition his violence might awaken. In an age in which Christianity was exerting some power, there was certainly a degree of deference due to the moral convictions of society. But Napoleon thought himself more than a match for the moral instincts and sentiments of our nature. He thought himself able to cover the

most atrocious deeds by the splendour of his name, and even to extort applause for crimes by the brilliancy of his success. He took no pains to conciliate esteem. In his own eyes he was mightier than conscience; and thus he turned against himself the power and resentment of virtue, in every breast where that divine principle yet found a home.

"Through the same blinding egotism, he was anxious to fill the thrones of Europe with men bearing his own name, and to multiply every where images of himself. Instead of placing over conquered countries, efficient men taken from themselves, who, by upholding better institutions, would carry with them large masses of the people, and who would still, by their hostility to the old dynasties, link their fortunes with his own, he placed over nations such men as Jerome and Murat. He thus spread a jealousy of his power, whilst he rendered it insecure; for as none of the princes of his creation, however well-disposed, were allowed to identify themselves with their subjects, and to take root in the public heart, but were compelled to act, openly and without disguise, as satellites and prefects of the French emperor; they gained no hold on their subjects, and could bring no strength to their master in his hour of peril. In none of his arrangements, did Napoleon think of securing to his cause the attachment of nations. Astonishment, awe, and force were his weapons, and his own great name the chosen pillar of his throne.

"So far was Bonaparte from magnifying the contrast and distinctions between himself and the old dynasties of Europe, and from attaching men to himself by new principles and institutions, that he had the great weakness, for so we view it, to revive the old forms of monarchy, and to ape the manners of the old court, and thus to connect himself with the herd of legitimate sovereigns. This was not only to rob his government of that imposing character which might have been given to it, and of that interest which it might have inspired, as an improvement on former institutions, but was to become competitor in a race in which he could not but be distanced. He could indeed pluck crowns from the heads of monarchs; but he could not by any means infuse their blood into his veins, associate with himself the ideas which are attached to a long line of ancestry, or give to his court the grace of manners, which belongs to older establishments. His true policy was, to throw contempt on distinctions, which he could not rival; and had he possessed the genius and spirit of the founder of a new era, he would have substituted for a crown, and for other long worn badges of power, a new and simple style of grandeur, and new insignia of dignity, more consonant with an enlightened age, and worthy of one who disdained to be a vulgar king. By the policy which he adopted, if it be worthy of that name, he became a vulgar king, and showed a mind incapable of answering the wants and demands of his age. It is well known, that the progress of intelligence had done much in Europe, to weaken men's reverence for pageantry and show. Nobles had learned to lay aside their trappings in ordinary life, and to appear as gentlemen. Even royalty had begun to retrench its pomp; and in the face of all this

improvement, Bonaparte stooped from his height, to study costumes, to legislate about court dresses, and court manners, and to outshine his brother monarchs in their own line. He desired to add the glory of master of ceremonies to that of conqueror of nations. In his anxiety to belong to the caste of kings, he exacted scrupulously the observance and etiquette with which they are approached. Not satisfied with this approximation to the old sovereigns, with whom he had no common interest, and from whom he could not have removed himself too far, he sought to ally himself by marriage with the royal families in Europe, to engraft himself and his posterity on an old imperial tree. This was the very way to turn back opinion into its old channels; to carry back Europe to its old prejudices; to facilitate the restoration of its old order; to preach up legitimacy; to crush every hope that he was to work a beneficent change among nations. It may seem strange, that his egotism did not preserve him from the imitation of antiquated monarchy. But his egotism, though excessive, was not lofty, nor was it seconded by a genius, rich and inventive, except in war.

"We have now followed Napoleon to the height of his power, and given our views of the policy by which he hoped to make that power perpetual and unbounded. His fall is easily explained. It had its origin in that spirit of self-reliance and self-exaggeration, of which we have seen so many proofs. It began in Spain. That country was a province in reality. He wanted to make it one in name; to place over it a Bonaparte; to make it a more striking manifestation of his power. For this purpose, he "kidnapped" its royal family, stirred up the unconquerable spirit of its people, and, after shedding on its plains and mountains the best blood of France, lost it for ever. Next came his expedition against Russia, an expedition against which his wisest counsellors remonstrated, but which had every recommendation to a man who regarded himself as an exception to his race, and able to triumph over the laws of nature. So insane were his self-confidence and impatience of opposition, that he drove by his outrages, Sweden, the old ally of France, into the arms of Russia, at the very moment that he was about to throw himself into the heart of that mighty empire. On his Russian campaign we have no desire to enlarge. Of all the mournful pages of history, none are more sad than that which records the retreat of the French army from Moscow. We remember, that when the intelligence of Napoleon's discomfiture in Russia first reached this country, we were among those who exulted in it, thinking only of the results. But when subsequent and minuter accounts brought distinctly before our eyes that unequalled army of France, broken, famished, slaughtered, seeking shelter under snow-drifts, and perishing by intense cold, we looked back on our joy with almost a consciousness of guilt, and expiated by a sincere grief our insensibility to the sufferings of our fellow creatures. We understand that many interesting notices of Napoleon, as he appeared in this disastrous campaign, are given in the Memoirs of Count Segur, a book, from which we have been

repelled by the sorrows and miseries which it details. We can conceive few subjects more worthy of Shakespeare than the mind of Napoleon, at this moment, when his fate was sealed; when the tide of his victories was suddenly stopped and rolled backwards; when his dreams of invincibleness were broken as by a peal of thunder; when the word, which had awed nations, died away, on the bleak waste, a powerless sound; and when he, whose spirit Europe could not bound, fled in fear from a captive's doom. The shock must have been tremendous to a mind so imperious, scornful, and unschooled to humiliation. The intense agony of that moment, when he gave the unusual orders, to retreat; the desolateness of his soul, when he saw his brave soldiers, and his chosen guards sinking in the snows, and perishing in crowds around him; his unwillingness to receive the details of his losses, lest self-possession should fail him; the levity and badinage of his interview with the Abbe de Pradt at Warsaw, discovering a mind labouring to throw off an insupportable weight, wrestling with itself, struggling against misery; and though last not least, his unconquerable purpose, still clinging to lost empire as the only good of life; these workings of such a spirit would have furnished to the great dramatist a theme, worthy of his transcendent powers.

"By the irretrievable disasters of the Russian campaign, the empire of the world was effectually placed beyond the grasp of Napoleon. The tide of conquest had ebbed, never to return. The spell which had bound the nations was dissolved. He was no longer the Invincible. The weight of military power, which had kept down the spirit of nations, was removed, and their long smothered sense of wrong and insult, broke forth like the fires of a volcano. Bonaparte might still, perhaps, have secured the throne of France; but that of Europe was gone. This however, he did not, could not, would not understand. He had connected with himself too obstinately, the character of the world's master, to be able to relinquish it. Amidst the dark omens which gathered round him, he still saw in his past wonderful escapes, and in his own exaggerated energies, the means of rebuilding his fallen power. Accordingly the thought of abandoning his pretensions does not seem to have crossed his mind, and his irreparable defeat was only a summons to new exertion. We doubt, indeed, whether Napoleon, if he could have understood fully his condition, would have adopted a different course. Though despairing, he would probably have raised new armies, and fought to the last. To a mind, which has placed its whole happiness in having no equal, the thought of descending to the level even of kings, is intolerable. Napoleon's mind had been stretched by such ideas of universal empire, that France, though reaching from the Rhine to the Alps, seemed narrow to him. He could not be shut up in it. Accordingly, as his fortunes darkened, we see no signs of relenting. He could not wear, he said, 'a tarnished crown,' that is, a crown no brighter than those of Austria and Russia. He continued to use a master's tone. He showed no change, but such as opposition works in the obstinate. He lost his temper and grew sour. He heaped re-

proaches on his marshals, and the legislative body. He insulted Metternich, the statesman, on whom, above all others, his fate depended. He irritated Murat by sarcasms, which rankled within him, and accelerated, if they did not determine, his desertion of his master. It is a striking example of retribution, that the very vehemence and sternness of his will, which had borne him onward to dominion, now drove him to the rejection of terms which would have left him a formidable power, and thus made his ruin entire. Refusing to take counsel of events, he persevered in fighting with a stubbornness, which reminds us of a spoiled child, who sullenly grasps what he knows he must relinquish, struggles without hope, and does not give over resistance, until his little fingers are one by one unclenched from the object on which he has set his heart. Thus fell Napoleon. We shall follow his history no farther. His retreat to Elba, his irruption into France, his signal overthrow, and his banishment to St. Helena, though they add to the romance of his history, throw no new light on his character, and would of course contribute nothing to our present object. There are indeed incidents in this portion of his life, which are somewhat inconsistent with the firmness and conscious superiority which belonged to him. But a man, into whose character so much impulse, and so little principle entered, must not be expected to preserve unblemished, in such hard reverses, the dignity and self-respect of an emperor and a hero.

(To be Continued.)

REVIEW.

"*Three Questions proposed and answered, concerning the Life forfeited by Adam, the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Punishment. By the Rev. David Thom.*"

This pamphlet is the production of an original and thinking mind. It evinces an ardent desire for the knowledge of Christian truth. It shows an individual, regardless of the systems of man's devising, pursuing his inquiries with an eye steadfastly fixed on the acquisition of Scriptural information, and desirous of deriving the doctrines of faith from the pure and sacred fountain of the Bible. Mr. Thom is a native of Glasgow. Educated in the belief of the Assembly's Catechism, and being from his youth of exemplary character, he was early destined to the Church of Scotland. Of that Church, he was a regularly ordained minister. Some years since, he settled with the Scots Church in Liverpool, as successor, we believe, to the Rev. Dr. Barr, now of Port-Glasgow, an individual who, during

Mr. Harris's residence in Liverpool, distinguished himself by publishing a pamphlet in vindication of the existence and agency of the Devil. Contentions having arisen between Mr. Thom and the proprietors of the church, a considerable number of the congregation left with him, and built a very handsome chapel in Rodney-Street. Here, after a short time, Mr. Thom was charged with holding tenets deemed to be inimical to the doctrines of the Confession of Faith. For this supposed heresy, which seemed to us to consist partly of truth, and partly to be Calvinism in most rank luxuriance—Calvinism carried out to its legitamate consequences—Mr. Thom was cited before the Presbytery of Glasgow. Long and various were the discussions which ensued, on the supposed perversions of the creed of his forefathers. A verdict of guilty was however pronounced, and Mr. Thom was deposed from his situation. Still numbers of his people adhered to him, and worship was conducted by Mr. Thom in the Music Hall, Bold-Street. Once set free from the trammels of the Established Church, the scales of prejudice appear to have gradually fallen from the mental vision of this excellent individual. His present pamphlet is dedicated to several persons by name, and to "the other friends of *free discussion in matters of religion*, by whom he was supported in his late arduous struggle with the Presbytery of Glasgow."

In the work which we are now noticing, the author, in opposition to the popular ideas of the day, considers,

"The death, with which Adam was menaced, in case of disobedience, and which he actually incurred, was death in the ordinary acceptation of the term, that is, the termination of the animal existence, which God, at his creation, had conferred on him, followed by the dissolution of his body."

This opinion, Mr. Thom supports by a variety of arguments, inquiring whether the general views on this subject may not be referred rather to Milton's Paradise Lost, than to the Bible, and replying to the usual statements made in defence of the common views with great force.

On the second question, the author endeavours to show that we are to rise from the dead, not in consequence of our connection with Adam, but solely in virtue of that which we bear to the Lord Jesus.

To the last matter proposed for investigation, Mr. Thom resolutely enters the lists against the doctrine of eternal

torments and unlimited punishment. On the long vaunted argument of the infinite nature of sin, because committed against an infinite Being, and therefore requiring an infinite atonement, the author remarks,

"But this argument, however much vaunted, is in reality a mere sophism, calculated to impose only on such as do not reflect, or are not capable of reflecting, for it is liable to objections which are completely fatal to it. 1st, If sin be infinite, it is possessed of a divine attribute or of the divine nature, infinity being an attribute of God, that is, in other words, sin, according to this scheme, is one with God. 2dly, Sin being the act of a *creature*, and it never yet having been pretended that *creatures* are infinite, we have, according to this rational, luminous, and consistent system, the *acts of creatures* invested with an attribute which does not belong *to those by whom the acts are committed*. 3dly, If sin be infinite, it cannot in any case *come to an end or be removed*, the very circumstance of its termination or removal declaring it to be *finite*. 4thly, If sin be infinite, it cannot have had a beginning. But has this ever been alleged? How, I ask, are these four objections to be got over?

"That it required an infinite atonement. This argument likewise is a mere sophism, for, 1st, was it by the human or the divine nature of the Lord Jesus that the atonement was made? If by the divine nature, then God suffered! the word atonement signifying the substitution of the sufferings of one being in the place of those of another. If by the human nature, then the atonement was not infinite. How will my opponents extricate themselves from this dilemma? Not surely by alleging, that although it was impossible for the divine nature of the Lord Jesus to suffer, it nevertheless imparted efficacy to the atonement made by his human nature, for this, besides being a barefaced *petitio principii* or begging of the question, would, after being stripped of its disguises, and of the tinsel and unmeaning language, with which it is decked, either be saying, that God himself suffered—as I am unable to comprehend any way in which an atonement can be efficacious, if the definition of the word is to be adhered to, except by adequate suffering—or it would be saying nothing at all to the purpose, by assigning to the word atonement a sense different from that which it ordinarily bears. 2dly, If it be maintained, that *an infinite atonement* has removed *evil*, which in its nature is *infinite also*, are we not then treated with the curious idea of *one infinite* bringing *another infinite* to an end? Who shall prohibit our calling this the climax of absurdity? Let any plain unlettered man, endowed with common sense, ask himself calmly and deliberately, what is implied in the word *infinite?* Is it not *absolute boundlessness of every description; a conditional or limited infinity*, like *a conditional or limited eternity*, being a perfect solecism in terms? What then is proved by the circumstance of sin, which theologians have been pleased to style *infinite*, being *removed or coming to an end*, except the impropriety and absurdity of the epithet applied to it, and the fact of its being in reality *finite* or *bounded?*"

Mr. Thom, in prosecuting this subject, appears to entertain views similar to those held by many of the American Universalists, that the punishment of iniquity will take place in the present life. For the arguments which he adduces in support of these views, we must refer our readers to the pamphlet. We think it will amply repay the perusal. That all at once, the mind which has been bound up in error and unused to intellectual freedom, should arrive at uniformly consistent ideas, is not to be expected. We unfeignedly rejoice that so much light has beamed on this gifted individual, as is manifested in these pages. We earnestly pray, that he may be blessed with more and more. We hail him as a coadjutor in the holy work of Christian Reformation. Differ we may on minor topics, but shall, we hope, agree to differ. On the essential doctrine of the unbounded benevolence of the Almighty, we are united, and that is the sentiment before which all others vanish into comparative insignificancy.

We rejoice in learning, that by his strenuous efforts, Mr. Thom's congregation is numerous, and, we hope, go with him in his love of truth, and ardent longings for scriptural teachings. The dedication we regard as a pledge that such is their spirit. May the author enjoy that happiness which he has feelingly depicted, in the paragraph with which we conclude this notice—a happiness which those who are struggling for the mental emancipation of their race, and the pure knowledge of the Father of mercies, cannot be deprived of, either by the calumnies of the ignorant, or the persecutions of the interested.

"If I shall be able to demonstrate, that sentiments, with which, in infancy, our minds are imbued, and which advancing years in general tend but to strengthen and confirm, are, in reality, the offspring of ignorance and superstition, fostered and nourished by tyranny and self-interest, and that, instead of illustrating and commending, they obscure, and are at variance with the character of the God of Revelation, representing *him* as a gloomy Despot, whom Scripture declares to be LOVE itself, I shall enjoy the supreme happiness of being instrumental in relieving such as are convinced by my arguments, from a state of most degrading and painful thraldom, and of seeing the hideous fabric which, for eighteen centuries at least, men have been engaged in raising and consolidating, crumble into atoms, at the touch of divine truth."

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *April* 1, 1828.

IT is this month our melancholy duty, to record the decease of the Rev. William Worrall, the Pastor of the Universalist Church in this City. He was a native of Manchester, and settled in Glasgow about twelve or fourteen years since. His thirst for knowledge was ardent. Although brought up in the humbler walks of life, by industry and perseverance, he attained to eminence both as a teacher of youth and a preacher of the Gospel. His goodness of heart, and truly Christian disposition, were evidenced by his daily walk and conversation. Although differing from those around him, on many points of doctrine, he was always willing to grant to others, that right of individual judgment which he himself claimed. In him, civil and religious liberty found a zealous and indefatigable advocate. He was formerly of Calvinistic sentiments; but was led to consider and embrace the doctrine of the unbounded love of God, by attending the preaching of the late Rev. Neil Douglas. When he saw reason to change his sentiments, no consideration of worldly interest deterred him from the fearless profession. On Mr. Douglas becoming unable to officiate, from old age, Mr. Worrall was chosen his assistant; and afterwards, the regular Pastor of the Universalist Congregation. This office he filled for five years, with honour to himself, and usefulness to that body of Christians with whom he officiated. In the exercise of a Christian spirit, we condole with his Congregation, on the dispensation of Providence which has deprived them of the services of their Pastor; but, believing as they do, that the Almighty does all things well, and that every event worketh for the final good of the whole human race, they will bow with entire submission to His holy will.

Mr. Worrall was the Editor of The Philanthropist, or Universalist's Miscellany, three volumes of which were completed at the close of the last year. He was also the author of several single sermons; and was ever studious in promoting the best interests of mankind. United with the Universalist Congregation in the belief of the great doctrine of the final restoration of the whole human race, to purity and happiness, Mr. Harris has offered to officiate on Sabbath evenings, to the Congregation, till they are settled with another Pastor.

We have also to record the decease, on the 9th December last, at Brattleborough, United States, of a venerable individual, whose manners and appearance, on his last visit to his native country, in 1818, made a deep and permanent impression on all who enjoyed the pleasure of his society. The accents of wisdom which flowed from his lips—"the prophetic snow which the winter of age had shed upon him"—the animation with which he detailed the progress of truth, and the establishment of liberty in the land of his adoption—and the interest with which he listened to similar information as to his father-land, will now be dwelt on with melancholy satisfaction. We copy, from a funeral sermon by the Rev. Dr. Willard of Deerfield, Massachusets, the following tribute to the memory of Dr. Wells:—

"Dr. Wells was born in August, 1744, at Biggleswade in Bedfordshire, in England. He was bereaved of his father, before he knew his worth, and of his mother at the age of seven years. After this, he was taken under the protection of an uncle in Carrington, where he was intimate with the philanthropic Howard. As there was no dissenting church in Carrington, he attended worship with his uncle's family in Bedford, in the society which had been rendered famous by the ministry of Bunyan. After some preparatory studies, he received his theological education in the school, which was successively under the superintendence of Doddridge, Orton, and Ashworth. On his introduction to the ministry, he was settled at Bromsgrove in Worcestershire, where he continued for more than twenty years; when, by the attractions he saw in this land of freedom, he was induced in 1793 to remove hither with his family, and settled in Brattleborough. Here, without being installed according to the usual forms, he discharged the duties of a minister, till the year 1818; when he visited his native country. After his return, he preached occasionally, but not constantly, till within about two years of his death.

"In speculation, Dr. Wells embraced in his youth those sentiments, which, in his riper age, he steadily maintained; believing in the personal unity of God, the subordination of our blessed Lord, and the all-sufficiency of that grace, which is provided through him for an apostate world. These principles, in connexion with those which are common to all Christians, were his guide in life, and his unfailing support and consolation in the immediate prospect of death. In his own opinions he was firm and independent, and of course he was forbearing and candid to others. In many of those whose opinions were at variance with his, he could see much to admire and commend. He was not disputatious in public or private. He dwelt chiefly, both in preaching and conversation, on those great principles which have the most direct bearing on the heart and the life. He was opposed to all needless

divisions; and though it was a matter of regret, that any of his fellow-labourers on the walls of God's spiritual house, 'should build with wood, hay, and stubble,' instead of the more solid and precious materials, with which all are in some measure furnished, it was still more painful to him to see them hindering one another, indulging mutual jealousies, and inflicting mutual pains. He was moderate—peaceful—and yet he was ever ready to vindicate the cause of those, who, in his apprehension, were suffering unjust reproach for the 'truth as it is in Jesus.'

"As a preacher, Dr. Wells was serious, instructive, and affectionate. No one who heard him, could doubt his sincerity. His style and manner in his latter years, which alone were known to us, were very suitable to his age; and if he did not make so much display as some others, we have reason to believe that, in that day, 'when they shall come from the east, and the west, and sit down in the kingdom of heaven,' many, from the old world and the new, will appear as happy witnesses of the fidelity and power of his preaching.

"Some, no noubt, have *published* too much. Of Dr. Wells, I think it is to be regretted, that his modesty did not allow him to publish more. He was active however, and perhaps equally useful in other ways. He was much in scenes of sorrow; in the abodes of sickness, death, and bereavement, administering those rich consolations, which belonged to his profession. He was much with his people too in seasons of health and prosperity; and, I believe, was a welcome visitor to the old and the young, in all places and at all times. In his manners and conversation, gravity and cheerfulness were happily blended. He was always entertaining, without descending from the dignity which harmonized so well with the majestic stature and form of his person, his advanced age, and the sacred office he filled. The domestic character of Dr. Wells was highly interesting and exemplary. In those declining years, which are too often marked with impatience, he knew well how to prize the kind attentions of his children and friends. He was predisposed to be satisfied and pleased with every thing they did. Between him and them, all was confidence and affection to the very close of his life.

"I have said that, on the approach of death, Dr. Wells found support and consolation in those views of religion which he had entertained from his youth. I might say more. For many years, death was a favourite subject of contemplation, and was viewed with so much cheerfulness and hope, that he could, and, as I believe, did adopt the language of Paul, and say, 'I have a desire to depart, and be with Christ.' It is true, that, under the lassitude and infirmities of the last four or five weeks, his hopes were somewhat obscured, and, like most other persons in the decrepitude of old age, he had some fears of death. These fears, however, were transient. When his sun was in the western horizon, it beamed forth without a cloud, and set in cheerful glory. He died on the evening of the Lord's day, December 9th; and, as we believe, has gone to enjoy that perpetual 'sabbath, which remaineth for the people of God.' He had 'fought a good fight; he had finished

his course; he had kept the faith.' In our sober imagination, we may now see him associated in glory with that great Apostle, of whom he was an humble follower, even as *he* was of Christ."

"The children of our honoured friend, will accept our sympathies under the bereavement they now suffer, in the death of one so justly respected and beloved, while they have our congratulations for the rich inheritance they still enjoy, in his immortal example, and in those counsels which are treasured in their memories. Though separated by mountains, or rivers, or a wide-spreading ocean from that tomb, which they would gladly make a frequent and sacred resort, the light of his example will attend them in every place; and, while they follow that example, his God will be their God, and his inheritance their everlasting portion in that better country, to which he has gone."

The Christians.—We copy the following account of this rapidly spreading American denomination, with the Editor's remarks, from "The Unitarian," No. 2.

"Another source of encouragement, which is calculated to animate us in the work in which we are engaged, is the success that has attended our past labours. When we first commenced planting churches upon the broad and liberal principles, which characterize the Christian denomination, it was maintained by the sects around us, that our churches would soon fall in pieces; and that the denomination would only exist on the page of ecclesiastical history, a monument of our fanaticism and folly. But twenty-five years have now elapsed since the first churches were planted, and so far from crumbling to pieces, they, by the grace of God, have been gathering strength, and have been enabled successfully to resist the waves of opposition, which have constantly been dashing against them. The success that has attended our humble exertions, to revive and disseminate the *faith that was once delivered to the saints*, has exceeded our most sanguine expectations. From the most humble beginnings, the denomination has spread through all the states in the union. Not less than a thousand churches have been planted since we commenced our operations, and our periodical works are constantly bringing the cheering intelligence, of new ones being established in all parts of the United States."

We have always looked upon the sudden rise and swift progress of the sect of Christians, as the most remarkable event in the religious history of our own times. We still think it so. It is the most remarkable, and the one most auspicious to the dissemination of just views of religious truth among the great mass of the people. Not less than a THOUSAND CHURCHES have been planted, in the space of TWENTY-FIVE YEARS, of Christians—among that class of people who must have drawn their theology from the Bible alone,—who have rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, and proclaimed themselves believers in the undivided unity of God. This is encouraging indeed, and a result hardly to have been ex-

pected; for though we have ever been confident of nothing so much as that if men would confine themselves wholly to the Bible itself as their book of theology, and follow the unbiassed deductions of their own minds, they would, as an infallible consequence, reject the doctrine of the Trinity as having no foundation in Scripture; we did not anticipate the surprising fact, that such a multitude, occupying such a place in society, would so soon be found, of courage and independence enough, to brave public opinion and religious power, and think and speak for themselves. That such is the fact, is, we repeat, in our judgment, the most animating circumstance in the religious history of the times.

The doctrine of the Trinity is the strong-hold of religious error. Let this be cast down, and a general ruin of the associated doctrines will surely and soon follow. In itself, this doctrine is comparatively harmless; and if the rejection of it implied nothing more than a disbelief in the metaphysical notion of God's threefold mode of existence, it would be a matter of far less consequence, one way or another. But it means more. It means, that the minds which have come to this result, are open to inquiry and conviction; have thrown off the fear of man; have resolved to form their own judgments in religious matters, and abide by them; have determined to follow wherever truth shall lead; and are ready to cast away other connected dogmas, however venerable and popular, as soon as they shall be seen to want the support of the plain, unambiguous language of Scripture; and in this view, the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity by the whole Christian denomination, is an event that assumes a most important character, and warrants the most sanguine anticipations of the future rapid spread of Unitarian views among the great body of the people. We rejoice in the prosperity of this sect. We heartily pray for it. Their cause is that of truth, and will prevail.

Test and Corporation Acts.—These remnants of an intolerant age, the House of Commons has resolved to repeal. If any thing had been wanting to excite a deeper detestation against their persecuting and polluting spirit, it would be found in the conduct of those Scottish Members of Parliament, who voted, not only against the rights and liberties of their fellow-countrymen, but even against their own. For although, on this side of the Tweed, an individual has not to play the hypocrite, or prostitute the dying memorial of his Saviour's love, on accepting office, still he cannot cross the Border, and enter on office, without being called on to do both. The conduct of those individuals, therefore, who appear in the list of the minority on that occasion, is a melancholy instance of the deteriorating tendency of political tests, and state religions.

We were among those who rejoiced in the decision on Lord John Russell's motion. But we rejoiced with trembling. We knew that bigotry and fanaticism would not lose their former power without another struggle. Our worst fears have been realized. Instead of meeting the question with manliness, the Church, through its organ, has introduced a clause which seems to us to retain the worst features of the original Acts. It is an alteration in form indeed, but the odious spirit still stalks abroad. The declaration insisted on, is, that the individual on taking office, shall promise he will not use his influence to subvert the established religion, or dispossess it of its rights and immunities. Such a declaration, no conscientious Dissenter can, in our judgment, make. As a Christian, he holds all connection of Christianity with the civil power, to be an abomination. As a Dissenter, he maintains that the Church is rioting in wealth, and that her forms are anti-christian. As a Unitarian, he believes her doctrines to be corruptions. How can this man affirm, he will not use his influence to stay this moral and religious plague? If he attends a dissenting chapel, he uses his influence against the Church, the influence of his example. If he be honest, it is his bounden duty to do all he can to uproot that which is opposed to the Gospel he professes to believe. Rather then, than see such a declaration form part of the Bill; we would that the original statutes remained in force. Let us have an open enemy, rather than a pretended boon. It seems to us, that requiring such a declaration, would be only adding insult to the previous injury.

Our readers will learn with pleasure, that in addition to "The Unitarian" at New-York, a periodical, entitled "The Unitarian Advocate," is now publishing in Boston, Massachusets, by the Rev. E. Q. Sewall. We observe, that in the First Number of "The Unitarian," the Editor has done us the favour to notice our Magazine. Our circulation he has, however, greatly over-rated. We know not, indeed, whether it exceed that of the English Unitarian periodicals, but we know, that it has very far exceeded our most sanguine expectations.

The Unitarian Congregation of Glasgow, gratefully acknowledge Donations from Manchester, Saltcoats, & Bath.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 21. MAY, 1828. Vol. II.

Notes on Passages of Scripture.

"IF God has condescended to employ any human language, in revealing his will to men, he has, by employing such an instrument, given us reason to conclude, that, by the established rules of interpretation in that language, his meaning must be interpreted."—*Principal Campbell.*

MAT. viii. 16, 17. "When the evening was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with demons; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses."

The passage in Isaiah, is as follows: "He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows," liii. 4. Now, the Evangelist, I think, does not accommodate these words of "the Prophet" to his purpose—does not divert them from their proper meaning. He cites them as an express prediction of one among the most memorable of the incidents in the life of Christ; and he is anxious to convince his readers that the prediction was accomplished. Such being his design, he employs one of the strongest of the forms of quotation, which occur in the New Testament, of passages from the Jewish Scriptures. If we suppose him to have drawn up his gospel in Greek, he even himself translates, and this literally and most faithfully, the language of the Prophet from the original: and of what that language was, and what its meaning, and its just application, we must, surely, allow Matthew to have been a far better judge than any the most admired interpreters through later ages.*

* On the more probable hypothesis, that this Evangelist wrote his memoir of our Saviour's ministry, in the Hebrew tongue, we are justified in assuming, that he has extracted Isaiah's own words, and that, by himself, or by some other individual, they were afterwards correctly rendered into Greek. Whichsoever of these suppositions we adopt, our conclusion must be the same. In either case, we have the high authority of the Evangelist, for the just reading and application of the text of the Prophet.

In the Public Version, the rendering of the clause, so quoted, should have been, "He himself took away our infirmities, and bare away our sicknesses.* If it be inquired, how Jesus Christ did this, the narrative supplies the answer: "When the evening was come," &c. He took and he bare away the maladies of men, not by transferring any of them to his own person, but by his miraculous and instantaneous cure of all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease, among the people.

Bishop Pearce surmises, that the 17th verse has been "inserted by mistake; having been at first a marginal or interlineal quotation of somebody, who judged it (though ignorantly) to the purpose of what is said in verse 16." Principal Campbell, too, says, "In our sense of the term *fulfilling*, we should rather call that the *fulfilment* of this prophecy, which is mentioned 1 Pet. iv. 24;" and it is evidently his opinion, that Matthew does nothing more than *accommodate* Isaiah's language. I submit, however, that Peter refers not to the 4th verse, but to the 11th and 12th verses of the Prophet's fifty-third chapter. The distinction will at once be evident to any man, who compares together the three verses in the original: neither the subject nor the phraseology is the same.

John iv. 9. "The Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.

Of the fact thus stated, Luke ix. 53, is a clear illustration. The Jews had *no familiar intercourse* with the Samaritans;† and least of all that social intercourse, which consists in a joint participation of the same meal—in *eating and drinking together*. Hence the astonishment of the woman of Samaria, at our Lord's saying unto her, "Give me to drink." The people of the East have always laid the greatest stress on such acts, as marks of patronage and friendship: in some cases, however, religious prejudices have placed an insuperable barrier in the way of these signs of hospitable attention being either manifested or accepted. Among the passages of Scripture, which refer to the custom, and are explained by it, I may notice Obad. v. 7. Mark ii. 15, 16. Gal. ii. 12. I, moreover, find Bishop Heber relating of the Hindoos, that "so long as they are not baptized, *nor eat nor drink* in company with Christians or Pariars, all is well," &c.—*Indian Journals*, I. 289.

* See 1 Sam. xvii. 34. Isaiah xlvi. 4. † That they were connected together in the way of buying and selling, is plain from v. 8 of this chap.

1 Cor. i. 16. "And I baptized also, the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other."

The observations suggested by this verse, are offered with becoming deference, as supplementary to those of Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, 1 Cor. No. viii.

That most valuable writer represents the propriety exhibited in the whole passage, 14–17; the proof of reality which it affords, and the undesigned coincidence between the few examples of the Apostle's personal administration of baptism, and his present notice of them. Perhaps, something may and ought to be added, concerning the way in which Paul mentions his having "baptized also the household of Stephanas." This strikes me, as being very natural and artless; exceedingly like an individual writing a letter, with the views, and under the circumstances, of our Apostle. The author's mind is full of his subject: he sets down his ideas just as they occur to him, and does not allow himself time to arrange them with the most exact method. In familiar conversation, in the negligent freedom, in the unavoidable haste, of epistolary correspondence, the same kind of thing perpetually takes place. On the other hand, we do not meet with it in studied compositions; and it seems beyond the reach of a sophist and a forger. Paul speaks first of two distinguished individuals, *Crispus* and *Gaius*, who had been baptized by himself. Of these persons he naturally thought much: and he proceeds to give the reason, why he so rarely performed the ordinance of baptism. No sooner has he stated the cause, than he recollects a family—the household of Stephanas—for whom he did the same office: and this family he mentions, accordingly, without being solicitous to remember or record other examples.* Such a mode of expression—such an eagerness to insert an afterthought, thus suggested—harmonizes, most evidently, with truth—with scenes and incidents that had an actual existence.

1 Cor. xv. 32. "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

The Apostle, I think, does not use this language in his own character, but as the exclamation of a heathen voluptuary, whose situation, he intimates, would be happier than

* Singulorum memoriæ relinquit per quos sint baptizati.—Bengel.

his own, and his conduct more prudent, if it be true, that "the dead rise not."

In desperate circumstances, and under the pressure, or the fear, of personal evils, men who had no knowledge—either speculative or practical—of religion, have generally been intent on the unrestrained gratification of their senses and appetites. To make the most of the few remaining hours of health and life, has been their sole object: and, unhappily, they were acquainted with no bliss superior to the enjoyment of some of the grossest pleasures. How different from this, was the situation—the conduct—of Paul, and of his companions, in the faith and ministry of the Gospel! Still, to speak conformably with human judgment, they had nothing for which to hope in this world, but altogether the reverse. Why, then, did they not adopt the Epicurean exclamation before us, and follow the course which it recommends? The answer is, because they possessed an assurance, at once enlightened and firm, of the resurrection of the dead.

J. J. Wetstein [N. T. in loc.] has made numerous citations from the classical writings of antiquity, in illustration of the words "let us eat," &c. I will produce an additional reference: it is to Thucyd. b. ii. § 53. In describing the effects of the plague at Athens, the historian observes, that numbers of the citizens, disdaining the control of religious principle, gave an unbounded licence to their love of sensual delights; and this, because they looked upon their lives and their estates as alike precarious—because they regarded both as the possessions of a day. Hence, these wretched men lost sight of moral distinctions, and had no rule of right, except their own feeling of temporary happiness. Nor would they exercise any self-denial, or encounter any difficulties, for even an honourable end; since they were quite uncertain, whether, on paying this price for it, they should survive long enough to make the acquisition.

Rev. i. 10. "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." The meaning is, 'I had a divine vision on the first day of the week'—the day particularly appropriated by Christians, to social worship and religious instruction, because it was a memorial of their *Lord's* resurrection from the dead. There are other traces of it in the New Testament.*

* Acts xx. 7.—1 Cor. xvi. 2.

The Sabbath of former covenants* has been abrogated by Christianity. Christianity knows nothing of a *Sabbath*, as one of its own institutions. It retains no part of the Mosaic ceremonial—none of the ordinances created or modified by the law. There is great incongruity in the words which compose the phrase, "the Christian Sabbath." Such terms ought to be no longer current: they are forbidden, by the letter and the spirit of all which Evangelists have recorded, and Apostles taught.

March 30, 1828. N.

Matthew the Evangelist, a Unitarian.

(Continued from page 272.)

III. I remark in the next place, that we may reason from the general tenor and prevailing language of Matthew's Gospel, to his ignorance of the doctrine of the Trinity; if true, it would have entered deeply into the structure and sentiment of his Gospel.

It is obvious enough what is meant by the general tenor of a book. For example, throughout the whole Bible, God is spoken of and described as a *Spirit.* His spirituality is taught or implied every where. If two, or three, or more expressions should *seem* to contradict this truth, it is certain that the contradiction can only be an apparent one; and though we might not be able satisfactorily to interpret them in consistency with that truth, we still should not be justified in bending to *them* the universal doctrine of the Bible. In many places in Scripture, hands and arms, eyes and ears, and a bodily form, are ascribed to the Deity; yet we may not therefore believe that the Deity is clothed with flesh like ourselves, but we refer to the general tenor and prevailing doctrine of the Bible, and explain these expressions so as to harmonise with it. Similar illustrations might be abundantly multiplied. But I will only add generally, in this connexion, that were the doctrines of orthodoxy rigorously tried by this rule, and there cannot be a juster one, they could not stand the test. Who will not say, that the general doctrine of the Bible is, that man is able to do well or ill as he pleases? On this, are grounded the promises and threatenings of religion,

* Anti-patriarchal, Patriarchal, and Jewish.

which run through the whole Bible, and stand forth on every page, But what, then, becomes of the doctrine of Total Depravity, which rests for its support on a few insulated texts? What is more evidently the current language, and universal sense of the Bible than this, that the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him? But what, then, becomes of the Atonement? Orthodoxy rests on detached sentences, insulated texts, strong figures, and remote inferences and analogies. The current sense of Scripture, the spirit of its teachings, the broad and obvious meaning of its most plain and intelligible parts, are all fatal to it. The general tenor and prevailing language of Matthew's Gospel, show that he had no faith in the doctrine of the Trinity, or the Deity of Jesus Christ. No one can be found to deny, whether Orthodox or not, that the Unity of God, and the dependence of Jesus on him, are the doctrines that enter most deeply into the very texture of the Gospel. I am ready to affirm, and with little fear of contradiction by any intelligent believer in the doctrines I oppose, that the *general tenor* of Matthew's Gospel, is so decidedly hostile to those doctrines, that the individual cannot be found, of a mind unprepossessed in relation to them, or ignorant of them, who, after a diligent perusal and study of that Gospel, would even surmise their truth. Having learned the doctrines from other sources, from Catechisms and Confessions of Faith, then, indeed, texts may be found which will *bear* a meaning consistent with their truth, but not one to *require* it; still less, one that directly teaches them. The Catholic gathers a strong argument for the doctrine of the Real Presence, from this Gospel, far stronger than the Trinitarian gathers for the doctrine of the Trinity, from the whole Bible; for he finds it laid down in express terms, "Take, eat, this is my body." And why does not the Trinitarian Protestant receive this mystery? Not because it cannot boast the most express declarations of Scripture in its favour—all the Evangelists unite in teaching it, in definite, intelligible language—but because, among other reasons, it is contrary to the general tenor of the Gospels; it is not in keeping, not of a piece, with the rest; and, therefore, he understands the Evangelists in such places, to use figurative expressions, which he interprets so as to harmonize with the other plainer and undoubted doctrines

of religion. Now, the same principle of proceeding should lead him to interpret the few texts in this Gospel which will bear a Trinitarian sense, in consistency with the tenet of the entire Unity of God, which every where pervades the book. The text containing the form of Baptism, is quite as insulated, and solitary in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity, as that which seems to teach the mystery of Transubstantiation is in relation to that doctrine; and yet, here the Trinitarian abandons his adopted principles of criticism, which had so kindly saved him from the dreaded faith of the Catholic Church, and most perversely—I am almost ready to say wickedly—contends, under circumstances as nearly similar as possible, that the whole Gospel, though diametrically opposed to it, shall bend to the meaning of one verse which is supposed to teach the doctrine of the Trinity!

IV. If the doctrine of the Trinity is one which Jesus taught, and Matthew learned, then is the Evangelist's fidelity as a historian brought into question; for he has not taught it with the clearness and frequency that became so important a doctrine, and which were necessary to its universal reception.

One of two things must be true, either our Lord did not, for some reason, teach the doctrine during his ministry, or Matthew has been culpably negligent in recording it—or rather, has altogether omitted to record it.

That our Saviour did not teach the *whole* of his religion to his immediate disciples, there is no good ground for believing. The *fact* that it was to be imparted to the Gentiles, was not indeed fully understood and admitted until after Peter's vision. But there is not a single *doctrine* to be found advanced by any of the Apostles, which is not contained in the recorded discourses of our Saviour himself. That he withheld the mysteries of the Trinity and Atonement, as some of the ancient fathers maintained, reserving them for later communications through John, is mere assumption, and a most unfortunate one too; as, of all the writers of the New Testament, John is the most distinct and emphatic in his testimony to the Unity and Supremacy of the Father. Not to add, that the advocates of the Trinity, by adopting the idea that John first taught it, lose whatever advantage is to be derived from the testimony of the other books of the New Testament, which were all, with the exception of his own Epistles, written before his Gospel.

It remains therefore, that Matthew must have been fully initiated into the knowledge of the Trinity. If true, it must have been represented to him as of the same indescribable value and importance which it is now supposed to possess. He must have received it, and believed in it, as the distinctive peculiarity of his Master's religion—the vital, fundamental doctrine of the Gospel. How criminally unfaithful has he been, then! He has professed to write a history of our Lord, and to give an account of his religion, yet the most important doctrine of that religion, he has suppressed, or has so obscurely alluded to it, that if, by any chance, *his* Gospel alone had been preserved, the world would have been for ever ignorant of it!

But it is a moral impossibility, that he should have been unfaithful or remiss in such a case. Every motive combined to make him faithful. If he was a *man*, he could not, in such circumstances, be otherwise than scrupulously so. Love of the truth, which he had preached so long, and for which he afterwards suffered martyrdom—attachment to his Master, whom he had followed so long—self-respect—all united to ensure fidelity, and a complete and perfect record. For all he knew or could know, his might be the only history that would ever be written by an ear and eye witness; and how could he be otherwise than most anxiously and minutely careful, that every truth of his Master should be recorded, and in a manner corresponding to its relative importance? But the doctrine is not contained or taught in his Gospel; or, at most, it is so obscurely implied, that it will not be pretended, that except testimony could be drawn from other quarters, it would be possible to establish it on the hints afforded by this Evangelist, or even to guess at the existence of such a dogma. Therefore, we conclude, that Jesus never taught the doctrine to Matthew—that the Evangelist never heard of it, and never intended to record it.

I have now presented some general considerations, tending to show, that if Matthew really believed the doctrine of the Trinity, it would have occupied a far more prominent place in his Gospel than has been given it; that it would have stood forth in strong, clear, statements, as the one great and distinguishing tenet of the religion of his Master. This has not been done. And there arises, therefore, a strong presumption that the doctrine is not a doctrine of his Gospel; and that such passages as have been thought by some to teach or imply it, are misunderstood.

(To be Continued.)

On Mystery.

It is generally admitted, that if Christianity be a revelation from God, it must contain evident traces of its author, and possess features which essentially distinguish it from all other systems; that if not manifestly superior to all that previously existed in the world, there would be no sufficient reason for its promulgation—it would be void of interest, and unworthy the source from which it professed to emanate; and, therefore, that Christianity will, if true, contain the requisite vouchers in support of its high pretensions, and possess those unrivalled and superhuman characteristics, which can alone demonstrate the divinity of its origin.

The Christian Unitarian, accordingly, finds upon it the impress of unbounded benevolence. He embraces a code of morality, which, displaying with resistless energy the perfections of Deity, portrays in simple but vivid language, the dependence of man upon a Creator's power, and traces out his reciprocal duties with a strength and clearness, compared with which, the most refined speculations, the brightest conceptions of sages and philosophers, are grovelling and insignificant. Its intimate acquaintance with the springs of human action—its immediate tendency to produce order, harmony, and peace amongst mankind—its valuable counsels and admonitions for every situation in which man can be placed—its adaptation to every ascent and advance which has been, or can be progressively made in knowledge and intellectuality, until perfection be as nearly approximated as mortality will admit of; nay, still proceeding in onward career, midst the wreck of elements and the crash of worlds, leading from imperfect to superior intelligences, from sublunary to celestial scenes, an angelic guide from time to eternity, the companion and counsellor of man, and his conductor from things of time and sense, to a never-ending existence and unfading happiness,—here are its beauties, its excellences, its heavenly character. The Unitarian embraces Christianity on still stronger grounds. Its promulgator, himself the pattern and exemplar of its requirements, a practical illustration of its effects, was a demonstration by the power of God of its truth; who, by rising from the dead, raised the veil which had hitherto bounded the views and hopes of man, brought life and immortality to light, revealed the truth of a re-

newal of existence, and exchanged for visionary speculations, the fact, that to this life succeeds the judgment. And believing, that the Mediator of the new covenant is appointed, by the behest of Jehovah, to glory and honour, far above the most vivid conceptions of mortality, and that his faithful followers will be beatified with him in regions of eternal joy—the Unitarian is conscious of the possession of holy truths, which unassisted reason could not possibly discover, nor imagination shadow out; which the most wise or enlightened of his race approached not even in conjecture, which he therefore considers to be truly worthy the designation of a revelation from on high, and as all-important knowledge for the sons of men.

But the peculiar doctrines of Revelation, as popularly held, are very different. Their advocates delight in dwelling upon them as inconceivable mysteries, to be received with a reverent prostration of the understanding—to be implicitly believed—not examined. Thus, difficulties have to be encountered at the very outset, since what is really revealed, is no longer mysterious,—that which is explained cannot remain still hidden and inexplicable, and to affirm it, is to affirm a palpable contradiction. To declaim, therefore, of the mysterious truths of Revelation, at which reason stands aghast, and faith herself is more than half confounded, is to be led away by mere sound, to the utter sacrifice of common sense. Mystery is not a peculiarity of Revelation; it is denounced in most expressive terms by the Apostle John. It has, indeed, long been a favourite with Christian professors, and can boast a most venerable antiquity on behalf of its claims; but mysteries in religion, and other equally venerated peculiarities, are of Pagan, not Scriptural origin; to prove which, is my present object.

Mystery, the inseparable concomitant of imposture, was borrowed by the primitive Christians from their idolatrous neighbours. Commencing with the outward forms of religion, and the celebration of worship, the insidious poison soon pervaded, and was amalgamated with the faith of the Nazarenes. "The precautions," observes a celebrated historian, "with which the disciples of Christ performed the offices of religion, were at first dictated by fear and necessity; but they were continued from choice. By imitating the awful secresy which reigned in the Eleusinian mysteries, the Christians had flattered themselves, that

they should render their sacred institutions more respectable in the eyes of the pagan world."* The same author subsequently asserts, as the practice at the time of Constantine's conversion, that "the awful mysteries of the Christian faith and worship, were concealed from the eyes of strangers, and even of catechumens, with an affected secresy which served to excite their wonder and curiosity."† From this unholy source, then, have those truths been lamentably distorted and disfigured, which he who runs ought to read and understand. The Church of Rome has sedulously preserved the deteriorating alloy; and all the existing churches of christendom, Catholic, Protestant, or reformed, save the Unitarian only, pertinaciously advocate the mysteries of Revelation.

That most august and imposing tenet which can boast such high pre-eminence in the creed of modern Christians, to doubt which is horrid blasphemy, but to impugn whose truth, is to close for ever the exercise of mercy, and call down the most tremendous wrath, even the doctrine of the sacred and ineffable Trinity, which is now the venerated idol of the Christian world, and is hedged round with care from prying examination, is borrowed from the crudities of pagan mythology—is a portion of the spawn derived from the wild and shadowy speculations of oriental philosophy. The Trinity, a peculiar doctrine of Revelation! No: but it is a grand and distinguishing feature of idolatry. Our barbarous ancestors revered a Trinity, long before they were blessed with the light of Christianity; it was indeed generally, if not always included in the creeds of the nations of antiquity; the trinities of Greece and Rome must be familiar to every one, and the Chaldee, Persian, and Egyptian trinities were then, as now, mysteries. To Egypt, that land of hieroglyphics and mystery, is Christendom indebted for her Trinity; from thence sprung that highly lauded symbol, by which men have attempted to bring down the mode of existence of Deity to mathematical demonstration. The equilateral triangle was an invention of the Egyptian priests, wherewith to express their triad, as in later days it has been seized upon as a happy illustration of the tri-unity of the Christian's God. Plato studied the hieroglyphical lore of Egyptian mythology, and tinctured thereby, the Athenian

* Gibbon, chap. xvi. † Ibid. chap. xx.

sage considered the divine nature under "the threefold denomination, of the first cause, the reason, or *logos*, and the soul or spirit of the universe."

Justin Martyr, the Samaritan philosopher, after being a disciple successively of the Stoic, the Peripatetic, the Pythagorean, and the Platonic schools, embraced Christianity as a useful philosophy, and amalgamated the *Logos* of his last master, with the person of Jesus Christ; and, it appears, was the author of the doctrine of his pre-existence and incarnation.*

The Orthodox Trinity is, therefore, of Egyptian origin, and is not a *peculiar* doctrine of Revelation. To assert this, indeed, proves the extreme length to which the advocates of an opinion will proceed, on its behalf. Thus, the tri-partite idol in the Cave of Elephanta, a fit companion for those emblems of a personal trinity, which once adorned the places of worship of Great Britain,† is looked upon by a zealous Trinitarian with intense interest, as worthy the admiration of the Christian world, and as a corroboration of the doctrine he so much admires. "The Hindoos," says Dr. Buchanan in his Christian Researches, "believe in one God, Brahma, and yet they represent him as subsisting in three persons." "Whence, then, have the Hindoos derived the idea of a tri-une God?" inquires he.‡ The conjecture which he hazards, that they have obtained it from revelation, and that its source is the plural termination of the word Elohim, requires proof. The term Elohim does not limit to three merely, as is conveniently assumed; it grants a latitude to range any where between unity and the bounds of computation; nay, it may even

* About the middle of the second century, the word Trinity was used by Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, to express the persons of the Godhead: about the end of the century, it was used to signify unity of substance and plurality of persons. The consubstantiality of the Father and the Son, was denied by the Council of Antioch, and decisively asserted by that of Nice, owing probably to the exertions of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, coiner of the phrase *a Unity in the Trinity*. To Athanasius is ascribed the discovery of the consubstantiality of the Spirit. Hence, the last finishing touch, the completion of this holy mystery, must be ascribed to that turbulent *saint!* not to Jesus.

† According to Burnet, the Trinity was represented by a man possessing three faces in one head; or an old man with a young man before him, and a dove over his head.

‡ Had the Doctor not been a Trinitarian, he would easily have traced the Trinitarian graft upon the stem of Christianity, to its true source; as it is, he is obliged to have recourse to a halting supposition, which does any thing but *prove* the Godhead to be limited to three only.

express what is surely sufficient for the greatest stretch of credulity, the 330,000,000 of deities acknowledged by the Hindoos. In India, indeed, the mystery of a Trinity is neither received as marvellous nor fabulous. "Tarachund Dutt, a native convert (to Christianity), residing at Vansvariya, in one of his publications on Christianity, entitled *Inananjun*, compared the three persons of the Athanasian Trinity, to the three persons of the Hindoo Triad, and described the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as respectively the Creator, Preserver, and Destroyer of the world."* Thus, the doctrine of the sacred Trinity, so far from being a peculiar dogma of Revelation only, is, in truth, a distinguishing feature of Paganism.

The same may be affirmed also, of that tenet, which teaches that God the Son, the second person of the blessed Trinity, became incarnate. A God-man, God veiled in a human form, is not peculiar to Christianity, or rather to that mystical system which has assumed the name. The incarnation of Deity is inseparable from the ancient systems. The religions of Greece and Rome swarm with instances: it is a familiar but an indispensable article in their creeds. Hence, the astrologers declared Christ to be Pan, the son of Mercury and Penelope—hence, the proposition made by Tiberius to the Roman Senate, to place Christ on their list of deities. To the natives of the East, it is the most familiar of all theological opinions. According to Dr. Buchanan, "the Hindoos believe, that one of the persons in their Trinity, and that, too, the second person, was manifested in the flesh; hence, their fables of the *Avatars*, or incarnations of Vishnoo."† Such being his creed, it is not surprising that the Hindoo should experience no difficulty in embracing the Christian incarnation: this amazing and mysterious peculiarity of Christianity, is not to him even remarkable. He will contend for the "Deity of Christ, in the same sense in which he will contend for the Deity of Krishna, one of the Hindoo incarnations, and admit the incarnation of Christ only as an *addition* to the incarnations in which he had previously believed."‡

---

* "Correspondence relative to the prospects of Christianity, &c. in India," p. 56.

† Christian Researches, &c.

‡ Which was avowed by Huridas, a native convert and even *preacher* in the employment of the Serampore Baptist Missionaries!—*Correspondence, &c. p.* 25.

The doctrines of the Trinity, therefore, and of an incarnate God, are not peculiar to Revelation; they are held in common with Idolators. Let the Orthodox professor look to it, that he does not embrace tenets for which he is indebted to the genius of Polytheism; let him prove, if he can, that these his favourite dogmas, have been filched by these Idolators, from his system without acknowledgment—that their origin is with the Revelation which he has embraced. If he even succeeds in accomplishing this, the very obvious similarity which his creed manifests with others, which it may please him to stigmatize as fabulous, will render him cautious as to charging Unitarianism with being the half-way house to Infidelity, seeing himself trenches so narrowly on the borders of Paganism; he will hesitate as to the propriety of continuing to accuse the Unitarian of the crime of denying his God, when he recollects, that, in the fundamentals of his own creed, he is so nearly united to the teachings of Polytheism.

S.

"*Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, occasioned by the publication of Scott's Life of Napoleon.*"

(Continued from page 279.)

"In the course of these remarks, our views of the Conqueror, of the First Consul, and of the Emperor, have been given plainly and freely. The subject, however, is so important and interesting, that we have thought it worth our while, though at the hazard of some repetition, to bring together, in a narrower compass, what seem to us the great leading features of the intellectual and moral character of Napoleon Bonaparte.

"His intellect was distinguished by rapidity of thought. He understood by a glance what most men, and superior men, could learn only by study. He darted to a conclusion rather by intuition than reasoning. In war, which was the only subject of which he was master, he seized in an instant on the great points of his own and his enemy's positions; and combined at once the movements, by which an overpowering force might be thrown with unexpected fury on a vulnerable part of the hostile line, and the fate of an army be decided in a day. He understood war as a science; but his mind was too bold, rapid, and irrepressible, to be enslaved by the technics of his profession. He found the old armies fighting by rule, and he discovered the true characteristic of genius, which, without despising rules, knows when and how to break them. He understood thoroughly the immense moral power, which is gained by originality and rapidity of operation.

He astonished and paralyzed his enemies by his unforeseen and impetuous assaults, by the suddenness with which the storm of battle burst upon them; and, whilst giving to his soldiers the advantages of modern discipline, breathed into them, by his quick and decisive movements, the enthusiasm of ruder ages. This power of disheartening the foe, and of spreading through his own ranks a confidence, and exhilarating courage, which made war a pastime, and seemed to make victory sure, distinguished Napoleon in an age of uncommon military talent, and was one main instrument of his future power.

"The wonderful effects of that rapidity of thought by which Bonaparte was marked, the signal success of his new mode of warfare, and the almost incredible speed with which his fame was spread through nations, had no small influence in fixing his character and determining for a period the fate of empires. These stirring influences infused a new consciousness of his own might. They gave intensity and audacity to his ambition; gave form and substance to his indefinite visions of glory, and raised his fiery hopes to empire. The burst of admiration, which his early career called forth, must in particular have had an influence, in imparting to his ambition that modification by which it was characterized, and which contributed alike to its success and to its fall. He began with *astonishing* the world, with producing a sudden and universal *sensation*, such as modern times had not witnessed. To *astonish* as well as to sway by his energies, became the great aim of his life. Henceforth, to rule was not enough for Bonaparte. He wanted to amaze, to dazzle, to overpower men's souls, by striking, bold, magnificent, and unanticipated results. To govern ever so absolutely would not have satisfied him, if he must have governed silently. He wanted to reign through wonder and awe, by the grandeur and terror of his name, by displays of power which would rivet on him every eye, and make him the theme of every tongue. Power was his supreme object, but a power which should be gazed at as well as felt, which should strike men as a prodigy, which should shake old thrones as an earthquake, and by the suddenness of its new creations should awaken something of the submissive wonder which miraculous agency inspires.

"Such seems to us to have been the distinction, or characteristic modification of his love of fame. It was a diseased passion for a kind of admiration, which, from the principles of our nature, cannot be enduring, and which demands for its support perpetual and more stimulating novelty. Mere esteem he would have scorned. Calm admiration, though universal, and enduring, would have been insipid. He wanted to electrify and overwhelm. He lived for effect. The world was his theatre, and he cared little what part he played, if he might walk the sole hero on the stage, and call forth bursts of applause, which would silence all other fame. In war, the triumphs which he coveted were those, in which he seemed to sweep away his foes like a whirlwind; and the immense and unparalleled sacrifice of his own soldiers, in the rapid marches and daring assaults to which he owed his victories,

in no degree diminished their worth to the victor. In peace, he delighted to hurry through his dominions; to multiply himself by his rapid movements; to gather at a glance the capacities of improvement which every important place possessed; to suggest plans which would startle by their originality and vastness; to project in an instant works which a life could not accomplish, and to leave behind the impression of a superhuman energy.

"Our sketch of Bonaparte would be imperfect indeed, if we did not add, that he was characterized by nothing more strongly than by the spirit of *self-exaggeration*. The singular energy of his intellect and will, through which he had mastered so many rivals and foes, and overcome what seemed insuperable obstacles, inspired a consciousness of being something more than man. His strong original tendencies to pride and self-exaltation, fed and pampered by strange success and unbounded applause, swelled into an almost insane conviction of superhuman greatness. In his own view, he stood apart from other men. He was not to be measured by the standard of humanity. He was not to be retarded by difficulties to which all others yielded. He was not to be subjected to laws and obligations which all others were expected to obey. Nature and the human will were to bend to his power. He was the child and favourite of fortune, and if not the lord, the chief object of destiny. His history shows a spirit of self-exaggeration, unrivalled in enlightened ages, and which reminds us of an oriental king to whom incense had been burned from his birth as to a deity. This was the chief source of his crimes. He wanted the sentiment of a common nature with his fellow beings. He had no sympathies with his race. That feeling of brotherhood, which is developed in truly great souls with peculiar energy, and through which they give up themselves willing victims, joyful sacrifices, to the interests of mankind, was wholly unknown to him. His heart, amidst all its wild beatings, never had one throb of disinterested love. The ties which bind man to man he broke asunder. The proper happiness of a man, which consists in the victory of moral energy and social affection over the selfish passions, he cast away for the lonely joy of a despot. With powers, which might have made him a glorious representative and minister of the beneficent Divinity, and with natural sensibilities which might have been exalted into sublime virtues, he chose to separate himself from his kind, to forego their love, esteem, and gratitude, that he might become their gaze, their fear, their wonder; and for this selfish, solitary good, parted with peace and imperishable renown.

"This insolent exaltation of himself above the race to which he belonged, broke out in the beginning of his career. His first success in Italy gave him the tone of a master, and he never laid it aside to his last hour. One can hardly help being struck with the *natural* manner with which he arrogates supremacy in his conversation and proclamations. We never feel as if he were putting on a lordly air, or borrowing an imperious tone. In his proudest claims, he speaks from his own mind, and in native language. His style is swollen, but never strained, as if he were

conscious of playing a part above his real claims. Even when he was foolish and impious enough to arrogate miraculous powers and a mission from God, his language showed, that he thought there was something in his character and exploits to give a colour to his blasphemous pretensions. The empire of the world seemed to him to be in a measure his due, for nothing short of it corresponded with his conceptions of himself; and he did not use mere verbiage, but spoke a language to which he gave some credit, when he called his successive conquests 'the fulfilment of his destiny.'

"This spirit of self-exaggeration wrought its own misery, and drew down upon him terrible punishments; and this it did by vitiating and perverting his high powers. First, it diseased his fine intellect, gave imagination the ascendency over judgment, turned the inventiveness and fruitfulness of his mind into rash, impatient, restless energies, and thus precipitated him into projects, which, as the wisdom of his counsellors pronounced, were fraught with ruin. To a man whose vanity took him out of the rank of human beings, no foundation for reasoning was left. All things seemed possible. His genius and his fortune were not to be bounded by the barriers, which experience had assigned to human powers. Ordinary rules did not apply to him. His imagination, disordered by his self-exaggerating spirit and by unbounded flattery, leaped over appalling obstacles to the prize which inflamed his ambition. He even found excitement and motives in obstacles, before which other men would have wavered; for these would enhance the glory of triumph, and give a new thrill to the admiration of the world. Accordingly, he again and again plunged into the depths of an enemy's country, and staked his whole fortune and power on a single battle. To be rash was indeed the necessary result of his self-exalting and self-relying spirit; for to dare what no other man would dare, to accomplish what no other man would attempt, was the very way to display himself as a superior being in his own and other's eye. To be impatient and restless was another necessary issue of the attributes we have described. The calmness of wisdom was denied him. He, who was next to omnipotent in his own eyes, and who delighted to strike and astonish by sudden and conspicuous operations, could not brook delay or wait for the slow operations of time. A work, which was to be gradually matured by the joint agency of various causes, could not suit a man, who wanted to be felt as the great, perhaps only, cause; who wished to stamp his own agency in the most glaring characters on whatever he performed; and who hoped to rival, by a sudden energy, the steady and progressive works of nature. Hence so many of his projects were never completed, or only announced. They swelled however the tide of flattery, which ascribed to him the completion of what was not yet begun, whilst his restless spirit, rushing to new enterprises, forgot its pledges, and left the promised prodigies of his creative genius to exist only in the records of adulation. Thus the rapid and inventive intellect of Bonaparte was depraved, and failed to achieve a growing and durable greatness, through his

self-exaggerating spirit. It reared, indeed, a vast and imposing structure, but disproportioned, disjointed, without strength, without foundations. One strong blast was enough to shake and shatter it, nor could his genius uphold it. Happy would it have been for his fame, had he been buried in its ruins.

"One of the striking properties of Bonaparte's character was decision, and this, as we have already seen, was perverted, by the spirit of self-exaggeration, into an inflexible stubbornness, which counsel could not enlighten, nor circumstances bend. Having taken the first step, he pressed onward. His purpose he wished others to regard as a law, or a decree of destiny. It *must* be accomplished. Resistance but strengthened it; and so often had resistance been overborne, that he felt as if his unconquerable will, joined to his matchless intellect, could vanquish all things. On such a mind the warnings of human wisdom and of Providence were spent in vain; and the Man of Destiny lived to teach others, if not himself, the weakness and folly of that all-defying decision, which arrays the purposes of a mortal with the immutableness of the counsels of the Most High.

(To be Continued.)

Memoir of the Life, Character, and Services of the late Rev. James Scott.

"Religion had *his* heart, *his* cares, *his* voice:
'Twas *his firm* refuge, as *his* earliest choice.
To holy *Simeon's* spirit not more dear
The church of Israel, and the house of prayer."

Of the excellent man who is the subject of this Memoir, it may with truth be said, that he filled a station exactly adapted to his own taste, spirit, wishes, qualifications, and means of doing good. The circumstances of his life, were few and simple: but they will be found important, as they affected—and, indeed, formed—his character; as they determined his lot, cherished his graces and virtues, and were, in the most considerable degree, the occasion of his usefulness.

The Rev. James Scott, was born at Stourbridge, on the 4th of March, 1768; being the third surviving son of John and of Elizabeth Scott. His strong inclination towards the ministerial office, discovered itself at an early age; together with a mind peculiarly fitted for the undertaking, and earnestly desirous of the scene of his future labours being the district, if not the spot, where they were afterwards so beneficially exercised. For his education,

he was placed first in a small private school, under the care of the Rev. Radcliffe Scholefield, at Birmingham. In the autumn of 1784, he removed to the academy at Daventry, where he diligently improved his high advantages for the acquisition of general, nor least of theological, knowledge. He settled at Cradley in 1789, and was ordained there in the following year. About this time, he was occupied in some arduous but finally very successful efforts, for the spiritual reformation of numbers of his poor and uninstructed neighbours. In 1807, he was associated with the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, his justly revered friend and former minister, most of whose views of Christian doctrine he himself took, in conducting the services at Stourbridge and at Cradley, on alternate Lord's days, and in performing the other parts of pastoral duty. From that period, he continued to divide his labours in nearly the same manner and proportion; never leaving the people of his care, excepting annually for a short and regular season, in order that he might invigorate his health. Thus employed, constantly devising liberal things, and going about doing good, he pursued his noiseless and eminently useful and happy course; greatly esteemed, warmly loved and regarded, wherever he was known—and where he was best known, most regarded and most loved. Such was the path in which he moved, until it pleased Almighty God, at a time, and in circumstances most gracious to the much favoured pastor, but awfully impressive in respect of his hearers and survivors,* to call his servant to himself.

A powerful spirit of devotion and brotherly love, combined with a temper naturally retiring and unobtrusive, and, on principle, and by cultivation, signally humble and modest, was the essence of Mr. Scott's character. This character, the chief incidents of his life particularly tended to create and strengthen.

Under the domestic roof, he received lessons, and witnessed examples, which caused Christian piety and kindness to be the governing principles of his conduct. The excellent person to whose charge he was afterwards committed, delivered the same precepts, and held out the same pattern.† On entering upon an academical life,

* Christian Reformer, vol. xiv. p. 39, 40.

† The Rev. Radcliffe Scholefield, was, for many years, the much respected Minister of the Society of Protestant Dissenters assembling at

Mr. Scott again experienced the happiness of being the member of a small family, at the head of which was a man remarkable for the gentleness, as for every other property, of heavenly wisdom:* and here he could prosecute his studies in the holy silence which he loved, and be exempted from the comparative agitations of a large and mixed society. Yet he cheerfully associated with his fellow-pupils, for every purpose which involved their common and dearest interests; and most with those, who, like himself, had the office of the Christian ministry in view. I cannot soon lose the pleasing impression, which my intercourse with him, upon occasions of that nature, made, from the first, on my mind. It is upwards of forty-three years since we so met: but the meeting appears to be as of yesterday. During those delightful and instructive hours, the superior piety, sweetness, and candour of his spirit were evident; while, in the progress of his academical course, other employments, in which he voluntarily engaged, together with his companions, cherished his desire and his habit of useful service—particularly as they gave him opportunities of statedly assisting in the religious instruction of the children of the poor.†

So retiring was he, and so unobtrusive, that only the commanding sense of duty prevailed with him, to bring himself before his fellow-men. In all such instances, his reluctance disappeared; though still he would not willingly

---

the Old Meeting-house in Birmingham; in which town he died, June 21, 1803. An engaging sketch of his life and character, will be found in the Monthly Magazine, vol. xvi. p. 379, &c. See, too, the Monthly Repository, &c. vol. ix. p. 565, 566.

* Of the Rev. Thomas Robins, "a brief" yet instructive "Memoir" was laid before the public, in the year 1810, together with "a sketch of the sermon preached on occasion of his death (May 20, 1810), by George Watson, and some biographical additions."

During the years which Mr. Scott passed at Daventry, the academical buildings were not sufficiently capacious to accommodate all the pupils, no small proportion of whom *lodged*, as the consequence, in private houses; while a few were both lodged and boarded in the family of Mr. Robins, and joined their several classes at lectures, and the whole of their fellow-students at prayers and academical exercises.

Mr. Scott's tutors were, the Rev. Thomas Belsham, the Rev. William Broadbent (who died Dec. 1, 1827), and the Rev. Eliezer Cogan [Mon. Rep. xvii. p. 285]: of these gentlemen, he uniformly spoke in terms of the most cordial respect and gratitude; and he was regarded by them with reciprocal complacency and affection.

† The institution of Sunday Schools, was, at that time, of recent origin.

be prominent—not the first to gain the regard of others. Whether I think on him as a Christian, or a Christian minister, I am reminded of the disciple who leaned on the bosom of Jesus, and possessed the largest share of his spirit—the disciple, who, uncalled, and with unconquerable affection, follows Jesus, yet follows him "with humble hope and silent love"—with no anxiety for spectators, and no clamorous or assuming zeal.

(To be Continued.)

A New-Year's-Day Discourse.

(Continued from page 266.)

I WOULD make a further improvement of the subject before us, by urging you to a more attentive, frequent, and serious perusal of the Holy Scriptures, as being the only method by which, effectively, you may discern "*both time and judgment.*" The Gospel communication not only carries the assurance, that a purer, and more exalted, and a more enduring state of being, awaits the termination of our pilgrimage on earth—our passage of the tomb—and our arrival on the threshold of eternity—together with the conditions, on the observance of which, an entrance will be afforded us into the mansions of the *New Jerusalem,* when the tabernacle of God shall be with men; but it also, with a merciful regard to our infirmities, in broad and discernible characters of information, instructs us, how that, by works, a man is justified—saying, this do, and thou shalt live—curse God, and die! This, then, at once and for ever, sets the question at rest, as to the necessity—would we so discern time and judgment, that, having suffered with Christ, with him we may be glorified—of a habitual and earnest resort being had to the fountain that casteth out her waters, under which dead things are formed. All, then, that remains for us to observe upon, is the attitude of mind, with which we should approach the *chambers of imagery* of the Most High God. To go to the Scriptures, to satisfy a formal observance, is one thing—to go to the Scriptures, with the sincere and fervent desire of spiritual manifestation, and of satisfying, not a famine of bread, but of hearing the word, is obviously another, and a very different thing. Now, though, in the one case, the Scrip-

tures must ever remain the words of a book that is sealed —in the other and latter case, they become the power of God unto salvation. And we put it to you each, which of these cases may be borne, with a personal application, upon the history of your several lives? Do you go to the Bible, as to an undeviating test, to determine the extent of the progress you have made towards the attainment of the Christian temper and life—carrying along with you the resolve, of conforming yourself, in the every imagination of your heart—and the every tendency of your will—and the every pursuit of your day, to the measure of its teachings? Do you go there, with the calm and steadfast determination, to kindle upon the altar of your affections, to the glory of God, a burning like the burning of a fire, and in its flame, to devour the briars and the thorns set against him in battle? Do you go there, with the meek and humble conviction, that the glorious beauty of holiness, springing from out the waters of bitterness, is a fading flower, and as the hasty fruit before the summer? Do you go there, with all the singleness of mind, and purity of heart, and simplicity and teachableness of disposition of a little child—ready to exclaim with Samuel, when the Lord calls, "Speak, for thy servant heareth?" Do you go there, to bring your unruly and sensual desires into subjection, lest that, by any means, you prove a castaway, and to learn of Christ, to deny yourself, and take up your cross and follow him? Do you go there as one dead in trespasses and sins, desirous of being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone? In one word, do you go there, with the earnest longing of being henceforth no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, but to come, in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man—unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ? Now, unless this has been the temper and habitude of mind, with which you have resorted to the Scriptures, there is much ground for apprehension, that the unsearchable riches of Christ hath been preached to you in vain; and that, although ye have read, yet have ye not understood the knowledge, in the mystery of Christ, according to the gift of the grace of God, given by the effectual working of his power; and that, when the book is delivered to you, with the injunction, "Read this, I

pray thee," the humbling confession must be made, "I cannot, for I am not learned." Here, then, is a broad and palpable field, over which you may expatiate with the every energy of your character, in the task of bringing yourself into subjection to your Creator. Here is a most necessary, and momentous, and a most pressingly needful preparation for you to make, ere farther you run the race, in which the immortal garland is to be run for. Here is one of the modes by which the "wise man's heart discerneth both time and judgment."

Another improvement of our subject, and the last that we shall bring before your notice, is the cultivating a more habitual piety towards God, and indulging in more frequent and serious contemplation of his excellent nature and attributes. Is it not a striking manifestation of the present infirmity and degenerate state of our nature, that, placed as we be, in the centre of so vast and grand an assemblage of objects, all proclaiming, in characters of a most obvious discernment, the agency of present Deity, and demonstrating by their various, and wondrous, and benevolent adaptations, that the one attribute under which he best loves to reveal himself to the creatures of his adoption, is that of the fondest, and kindest, and most long-suffering of parents—does it not speak impressively of the coldness and sterility of our hearts, that, unless roused from a state of supineness and worldly absorption, by some awfully striking, immediate, and personal interposition of Divine agency—unless we see the fingers of God, writing our condemnation on the very walls of our courts, our minds are unawakened to the presence and operation of Deity, unawed by his power, unabashed by his purity, unchecked by his knowledge, unmoved to his love, and participate as we may, in the exhaustless stores of his providence, our breasts remain untuned to one movement of acknowledgment—our desires unkindled to one glow of affection? The world puts forth its engrossing claims upon our regards, and we yield ourselves up, with an altogether unreservedness, to the schooling it prepares for us, till, involved in the web of its manifold attachments, our desires become fixed on the accumulating to ourselves the means of a still further advance in its rounds of pleasurable observance, and our habits of thought and action at length become drawn in a revolving orbit around it, as the one alone centre of attraction; and it too frequently occurs, that it is not till the

storms of adversity come up in array against us, and the heart is smitten and withered, and we say to those who would comfort us, Look away from me, I will be better in weeping;—oh no! it is not till we become a desolation and a hissing, that the utter feebleness of all worldly consolation, is brought with a sensible and acknowledged persuasion home to the understanding, and impels us with lacerated feelings, crushed hopes, and breaking hearts, to fling ourselves, bare and destitute, into the arms always open to receive us, and longing to enfold us in their forgiving embrace! Oh! it is a dread and fierce-smiting visitation for the child of sin, who, in the season of health and prosperity, neglected to guide his steps into the way of peace, but to choose, in preference, the paths of the ungodly—who sought, in the plaudits of the gay, and the unthinking, and the vicious, that unalloyed delight which (if any where) is found only in the secret places of an approving conscience—who raised the structure of his happiness upon the unstable foundation of a personal homage paid to his vices and his weakness, rather than in the sure and steadfast abidings of the Rock of Ages—who offered at the shrine of worldly and fleeting vanities, those energies and that devotion, which would have obtained for him as the stones of a crown, to be lifted up as an ensign upon the land of his God—who fixed his regards on the low and debasing gratifications of a sensual and grovelling inclination, rather than on those lofty, and purifying, and expanding contemplations, which become defined in brighter colouring and more enduring characters, as all else around assume a darker, shadowy, and a more forbidding aspect;—oh! sure it is a sore and awful dispensation, when standing, alone too, midst the wreck of all his former resources strewn around him, the deserted devotee of sinful pleasure, who, having lived without God in the world, knows not how to die with him, casts abroad the hurried glance of recognition, if he may find some object of appropriation on which he may repose his shattered soul, and to which he may cling in his mortal agony, but finds no ark of refuge to bear him across the billows of remorse, no satisfying assurance to appease his tremulous forebodings, till, at length, he goes to the grave without so much as one preparation, that shall avail him any thing at the great and final day of retribution—without one disposition commenced on earth, capable of being perfected

in Heaven! How strikingly the reverse of all this, is it with him, who has trained his mind to a habitual reference of every event to the will of an over-ruling Providence—who traces the guidance of His hand in every occurrence, whether toward or untoward to his desires, that befalls him—who commits himself, in his every undertaking, to the direction of Him who cannot err, reposing with perfect confidence in His appointments—assured, that whatever turn his affairs may take, however foreign to his calculation, however threatening the gloom that collects around his declining day—all is ordered for the wisest, and will ultimately best promote his good! No afflictive dispensation ruffles the serenity of his soul, for behind the cloud he sees a Father's smile; and as each tie that binds him to the circle of nature's charities, becomes relaxed, the chord that united him to the God of nature becomes contracted—as the fond intercourse of domestic endearment becomes broken and interrupted, the communings of spiritual relationship become closer and more habitual—as the interests of time become less engrossing, the delights of eternity become realized in clearer and more satisfying discernment—as the functions of the body become enfeebled and inervate, the breathings of the spirit become fervent and enlivened—and when the vision becomes closed to time and shrouded from the light of day, his contemplations are full of eternity, and fixed on the Sun of Righteousness! Here, then, my Christian friends, is an alternate character, presented for your appropriation. Can you hesitate which you will make your own? Can you delay your choice of that that has such commanding claims upon your regards—can you, withhold your concurrence, with the wise man's heart, in this further mode of discerning "both time and judgment?"

(To be Continued.)

REVIEW.

"*The Holy Bible, with Notes explanatory and critical, and practical reflections; designed principally for the use of Families.—By the Rev. C. Wellbeloved.*"

THE fifth part of this work, comprising the book of Job, has just been published; and we avail ourselves of the opportunity, to recommend Mr. Wellbeloved's Bible to the

serious attention and warm patronage of our fellow-Christians. The work we consider amongst the greatest that has ever been undertaken, for the advancement of Biblical knowledge, free inquiry, and correct principles. Upon an accurate translation it is evident that just apprehensions of revealed truth must mainly depend; while deep research and extensive learning are also requisite, to elucidate those difficulties in the Scripture, which ensue from the length of time that has elapsed since the publication of the several books of which it is composed, and also from the diversity of manners and customs, of modes of thought and expression, which exist between modern and ancient times. The Bible was not intended merely to inform, but to purify also. The chief object at which the writers aimed, was, to lead men to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God. This object makes it the duty of every scribe well instructed, to draw from the various scenes and circumstances which it presents, those lessons of sound morality and of elevated piety with which its pages abound. Then it is, that the writings of holy men of old are valuable, when we learn not merely the speculative truths which they taught or implied, but are led also to regard these truths in their practical bearings, and to feel their application to, and power over, the active impulses of our nature.

Mr. Wellbeloved's Bible is invaluable, because it effects these great objects. In it, truth is blended with holy admonition, and exhibited in its awful sanctions and requirements. Few persons are more fitted for the arduous undertaking, whether the varied and profound knowledge of the author be regarded, or his eminently pious and benevolent spirit; and judging from the parts of the work which have yet appeared, few, we may affirm, would have succeeded so well in the execution. Proceeding from one of the best informed, most ardent, and persevering advocates of Unitarianism, the work, of course, is and will continue to be in agreement with the leading views which are held by Unitarian Christians. It is, therefore, pre-eminently liberal in its spirit; exhibiting the sentiments of the Editor, with that firmness which a regard to truth dictates, and with that gentleness and benevolence of spirit, which, though not often the characteristics of writers on religious topics, are the most important requirements of Christianity.

Some branches of the prevalent Theology of the day, are thought to derive support from the book of Job. On this account, therefore, and more especially to enable our readers to judge for themselves of the value of Mr. W.'s Bible, we shall transcribe portions of his translation and remarks. The design of the book is thus clearly set forth; and we are the more ready to present the ensuing remarks to our readers, as they will materially assist those who may be confined to the common translation, in the right understanding and practical application of the truths which it contains. "In order to judge of the design of the *poem*, we should consider what intimations the writer himself has given of the lessons which he wished to inculcate. The subject of discussion, is evidently the occasion and design of human sufferings. The three friends of Job maintain, that Job is afflicted because he is guilty, since suffering is invariably the consequence of sin; and Job maintains, that notwithstanding his afflictions, he has not transgressed the commands of his Maker, and that there is no such necessary connexion between sin and sorrow, since, in fact, the most guilty are often most free from the trials and afflictions of life. Their discussion ends as it began: nothing is settled. But another speaker is introduced, who takes a different view, saying little or nothing of affliction as the punishment of guilt, but representing it as a means of virtue, and designed to bring men to reflection, and to lead them to a pious and zealous obedience to the divine will. Suffering is, according to the speaker, rather the admonition of a Father, than the retribution of a Judge. A part of the argument which he had advanced, is adopted and pursued by the Almighty himself, who passes no censure on this speaker: from which we may conclude, that his opinion is in fact that which the author wished to recommend. But the three other disputants, and Job himself, are blamed; the former, for speaking wrongfully of the measures of the divine government, and of the character of Job; the latter, for making himself more just than his Maker; and from this circumstance we may conclude, that the author further meant to teach that suffering is not to be regarded as a proof of guilt—that the wicked sometimes prosper, and the virtuous are depressed—yet, that the Judge of the whole earth can do only that which is right. But why, then, it might be asked, do the righteous suffer—why do the guilty and

the oppressor live in prosperity, and die in ease? The knowledge of a future state of righteous retribution, would have enabled the poet to solve this difficulty; but to that knowledge he appears, so far as we can judge from his work, to have been a stranger. In the speech attributed to the Almighty, we have the only answer which he thought could be given to these difficult inquiries. God is infinitely wise, and of irresistible power; man cannot fathom his counsels, nor resist his will. It is vain to contend with God, or to seek to know why he treats us as he does. He will give no account of his ways to mortals; if he did, they could not comprehend him. The duty of man, therefore, is, to submit to all his dispensations; to learn from them lessons of piety and virtue; and to acknowledge, that in all his works, and in all his ways, God is holy, and just, and good." In the 1st chap. verse 6, we find, "Now, on a certain day, the Sons of God went to present themselves before Jehovah, and the Satan also went amongst them." On the term "Sons of God," Mr. W. remarks, "most probably, the angels or ministers of the divine pleasure, by whom the orders of the Supreme Ruler of the world were supposed to be executed. This is not to be considered as history, but as a figurative representation of the course of the divine government, borrowed from the custom observed by the patriarchs in the exercise of their authority in their respective families, aided by their elder children and servants; or by kings in the government of their kingdom, aided by the advice and ministry of their council." And on the designation "Satan:"—"He appears amongst the Sons of God, and is evidently one of them. It seems to have been his special office to visit the subjects of the divine government—to take notice of their conduct—to report, from time to time, in the grand council of God, what he observed, and to accuse those who were guilty. The name, *Satan*, is not a translation of the original Hebrew word, but only a representation of it in English letters. The original word, is thought by some to be a noun formed from that which, in the next verse, is rendered 'going about.' If closely translated, therefore, it would be *the goer about*, and would denote the office which this minister, in the heavenly court, was supposed to hold, namely, that of *general inspector*. As one important part of his duty, was to discover and to denounce delinquents, the title, in process of time, might come to be

equivalent to *the accuser* and *the adversary*. This, indeed, may be its first signification, as it is by many understood to be, and that which it is intended to bear in this place."

The following translation exhibits the beauty and energy of the original. Chap. xi. 7–9:

> The deep things of God canst thou find out?
> Canst thou to perfection find out the Almighty?
> The height of the heavens! what canst thou do?
> Deeper than the grave! what canst thou know?
> Longer than the earth is its measure,
> And wider than the sea.

Upon which Mr. W. remarks, "'*What canst thou do?*' i. e. in discovering the excellencies of the divine nature, and the mysteries of the divine government. As the heavens are too high for thee to ascend to them, so the perfect knowledge of the Almighty is unattainable by thee." "'*The grave*'—rather the lower world. The deepest parts under the earth. It is constantly opposed, in the Scriptures, to the heavens, which denote the highest parts above the earth. The knowledge of the counsels and operations of the Almighty, then, cannot be fully obtained by man: if it could, the wisdom, the justice, and the mercy of his dealings would be seen and acknowledged." And in his reflections on the passage, "Though, by the most painful and laborious research, we cannot 'find out the Almighty,' we cannot but know his will concerning us. Let it be our first care to do his will, and the day will arrive, when we shall escape from this scene of ignorance, imperfection, and darkness, and be introduced into the realms of light, and life, and joy; where 'we shall no longer see as in a glass darkly, but face to face, and know even as we are known.'" Chap. xiv. 10:

> But man dieth, and is laid along,
> Yea, man expireth, and where is he?
> Waters flow away from a lake,
> And a river is dried up and exhausted,
> So man lieth down and riseth not again;
> Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
> Nor shall they be roused from their sleep.
> If a man die, shall he live again?
> All the days of my appointed service, I will wait
> Till my relief come.
> Thou wilt call, and I shall answer thee,
> The work of thy hands thou wilt desire.

"'*Till the heavens be no more:*' i. e. not at all; never. Such is the meaning which this and similar phrases bear in Scripture. Compare Ps. lxxxix. 29, 36, 37; lxxii. 7, 17; Deut. xi. 21; Jer. xxxi. 35–37; see also, Baruch i. 11. '*Live*

again.' Once dead, he knew he was dead for ever; when once admitted to the unseen world, it were vain to hope that he should be permitted to return. In the form of a question, he undoubtedly expresses the firm conviction of his mind, that when any one dies, his life, as to the present scene at least, is for ever extinct. This is evident both from the connection in which the language stands, and from various express declarations of Job, that no such renovation of his being was expected by him. 'The cloud, saith he, is dissolved and vanisheth away; so he that goeth down to the grave, shall not come up. He shall return no more to his house, nor shall his place own him again any more.' '*Till my relief shall come.*' By *appointed service,* he means his present suffering condition; and by *relief,* restoration to health, and ease, and prosperity. These terms are figurative, being borrowed from military usages, according to which, troops, after being for some time employed in active service, are at length recalled, and their place occupied by fresh forces. Reflecting upon the inevitable consequence of death, Job recalls the wish he had expressed (13th verse), and resolves to bear, as patiently as he could, the calamities that had befallen him, till it should please God to remove them, and vindicate his integrity. '*Earnestly desire:*' i. e. Thou wilt be anxious to do me justice, and to rescue me from my afflictions. He changes the metaphor in this verse; using the terms *call* and *answer* in a judicial sense: the former, denoting the action of bringing the complaint; the latter, the part of the defendant in replying to it."

The xix. chap. 23–27, which, has in some way or other, been compelled to afford an apparent aid to the doctrine of the Supreme Deity of Christ, Mr. W. thus translates:

> Oh that now my words were written!
> Oh that they were inscribed in a book!
> That with an iron style and with lead,
> For ever on a rock they were engraven!
> For I know that my Avenger liveth,
> And that hereafter he will rise up over the dust.
> And after my skin hath been thus torn,
> Still from my flesh I shall see God.
> Whom I shall behold on my side,
> And my eyes shall see, but not estranged from me.

"'*My Avenger;*' or *my vindicator, my deliverer, my patron.* The word in the original, is that which, in the Mosaic law, is often rendered the *blood avenger*, and also, *kinsman,* or *next of kin.* It denotes one whose duty it was, to see that

justice was in all cases done to his nearest relation: if that relation were slain, that his death was avenged on the murderer; if he were compelled to sell himself into slavery, or to part with his inheritance, that, if possible, both his person and his possessions were redeemed; and if any injustice were done to him, that he was succoured, and the oppressor punished. Job, therefore, is to be understood as expressing the firm conviction of his mind, that God would appear for him in this character; that he would clearly establish his integrity; and put to shame, and punish as they deserved, those who had so falsely accused him either of open or of secret transgressions. '*Hereafter;*' at length; what I now predict, will, in the end, certainly take place. 'The whole passage,' observes Mr. Heath, 'seems to be an anticipation of what is to follow at the conclusion of the poem, and is, indeed, a summary of it.' '*From my flesh;*' from my body, yet living. '*I shall see God;*' God will manifest himself to me; He will not hide himself from me, as he now does. '*On my side;*' propitious to me, defending and vindicating me."

These quotations will enable our readers to form some idea of the value of the work which Mr. Wellbeloved has now in hand; and we are not without a hope, that some may be induced to possess themselves of the original, by which, we can assure them, their knowledge and their piety can hardly fail to be promoted. G. C. S.

"*On Communion with Unbelievers, a Discourse, delivered in the Unitarian Chapel, Mosley-Street, Manchester, on Sunday, March* 30, 1828, *by John James Tayler, B.A.*"

THE occasion of the publication of this very excellent sermon, may be learned from the words of the writer, as stated in the preface.

"In the Manchester Chronicle of April 5th, the following singular article appeared: 'Unitarianism and Deism. From a highly respectable correspondent. We give the substance of a sermon, delivered on Sunday last, *pursuant to advertisement*, at the Unitarian Chapel in Mosley-Street, on communion with unbelievers (Deut. vi). It is rather singular, that such a discourse should have been founded upon such a text; but it is still more extraordinary, that a professed Christian minister should be the apologist of Infidelity, and plead for fellowship and communion with those who totally reject Divine Revelation. Unitarianism and Deism, are, if not the same thing, at least associated together in principle and affection.' An attempt [continues Mr. Tayler] is then made, to substantiate this very uncandid charge, by a most inaccurate representation of the discourse itself; instances of which I have pointed out

in the following pages, as well as more fully in a letter addressed to the Editor of the Chronicle this day. That the public may judge with what candour and fairness my statements have been represented, I have published the whole discourse, to speak for itself. Whatever may be thought of the soundness of the principle which I have recommended in the behaviour of Christians towards serious and moral Deists, I am convinced, that no person who peruses the following pages in a candid spirit, will regard the author of them in the obnoxious light of an *apologist for Infidelity;* but must discern in them, indubitable traces of a mind deeply impressed itself with the truth and divine authority of the Christian religion, and earnestly solicitous for the communication of its hopes and consolations to unbelievers." And, in the conclusion of the preface, "I cannot disguise my own firm persuasion, that, if the spirit which I have here (in the discourse) recommended, were more generally cultivated—if Christians would cease to proscribe and anathematize each other, and would conduct themselves with gentleness and candour towards those whose unbelief should be an object of compassion rather than of hostility—it would prove the most effectual of all methods, to accelerate the approach of that blessed period, which every good man desires to behold, when those sheep that are now lost and astray, and, unhappily, are not of his fold, shall hear the voice of the good Shepherd, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd—even Jesus Christ."

Fully participating in these amiable sentiments, we strongly recommend the perusal of the discourse to our readers.

"*Bible Controversy in Ireland. Infallibility not possible; [Mental] Error not culpable, &c.—Hunter, London.*"

THOSE who doubt the propriety or beneficial tendency of public debate on controverted questions in theology, will, we hope, have their doubts set at rest, by the effects which have followed the discussion between Messrs. Pope and Maguire at Dublin. It cannot be denied, that that discussion excited considerable attention at the time, and that its good effects have been carried on and improved to the best of purposes—free inquiry and the inculcation of righteousness and truth; first, by the admirable treatise of Dr. Drummond on the Trinity, which we had the pleasure of noticing, Vol. I. p. 459–65, and now, in the powerful work whose title we have placed at the head of this article. The work consists of nine letters, the greater number of which contain replies to the question, "Have I a right, in matters of Religion, to form a conclusion by the exercise of my own reason?" This question, involving as it does the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church, and the right of individual judgment, is most ably and powerfully argued. We shall enter more fully into the merits of this valuable publication in our next number. All we can now do, is warmly to recommend it to our readers. We can quote but one passage:—

"Irishmen! I understand the politics of our common land, and would correct them; I appreciate the evils of which you complain, and sympathise in your murmurs; I can perceive the ungenerous arts, too often the exasperating spirit, mixed up with the controversies which assail you, and lament their too certain effect in exciting your alienation and disgust; but, my countrymen, in the midst of all these sources of uneasiness, amidst all these interruptions to unprejudiced habits of thought, I will still regard you as capable of reflection; I will still believe it not impossible to speak to YOUR UNDERSTANDINGS with effect. I ask you, then, in all solemnity and soberness, may I, by the unaided application of that reason and conscience with which God has endowed me, be impressed with a conviction, that I must 'live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world,' if I would hope to be favourably judged at the tribunal of Christ in the next; and must I THEN have recourse to an INFALLIBLE GUIDE, demanding my implicit obedience, in ORDER to protect me from error in the MERELY ACCESSORY parts of religion!! Would God have made *all things* NECESSARY *plain*, as one of the Fathers, St. Chrysostom, expressly and justly asserted them to be, and then have vouchsafed so extraordinary an attribute as INFALLIBILITY to man, in order to direct me in things NOT necessary? Would the essential interests of my immortal soul, be left to the light and guidance of my own understanding, and a PERPETUAL MIRACLE be placed in the keeping of a privileged body of men, in order to conduct the mere forms, or prescribe the less necessary doctrines, of religion? May I learn by my own faculties, guided and expanded by the blessed intelligence which He has conveyed to us by His Son, that to love God with all my heart, and soul, and strength, and my neighbour as myself—to cherish, as I would eternal life, a conscience void of offence towards God and towards men—that in these consist the spirit of all acceptable religion, and the very essence of heaven itself; and must I have a SUPERNATURAL AID at my hand, to regulate the application of a certain quantum of oil to my several senses at my dying hour; or to inform me, that matrimony is a sacrament; or that bishops are divinely ordained; or that meats must be discarded on a Friday?—Nay, can we readily believe it to have been a special concern of Heaven, to inform us whether *homoousia*, or *homoiousia*, be the term more descriptive of the Trinity; whether the *perichoresis*, or, to use an *easier* word, the *circumincession* of the persons, be a doctrine of the Gospel or not;* or whether *Filioque*, added by one general council to the list of articles to be believed, render our creed more orthodox than it had been left by another general council, which decided that there should be no addition at all made to that creed?—all of which may be very interesting and elevating topics of inquiry; but we may assuredly be permitted to doubt, without ceasing thereby to be Christians, whether, to protect us from the danger of error in making up our minds upon any of these points, it has been actually provided by God, that the reverend and right reverend the Clergy, whether separately or congregated in council, should be invested with an attribute, which, if it be not omniscience itself, places them rather in the rank of celestial than of earthly natures!"

"And, my rational countrymen!—if, instead of busying themselves from age to age, in heaping article after article upon the consciences of

* "Speaking of the procession or emanation of the two other Persons of the Trinity from the Father, we have the following quotation from St. Ambrose, by Bishop Bull, which, as a specimen of exquisite verbiage, is not perhaps to be equalled:—'*Ex* ipso sunt, quia non a se; et *in* ipso, quia non separata; et ipsum ipsa quod ipse, et ipsum ipse quod ipsa: et non ipsum ipsa qui ipse; et non ipsa ipse quæ ipsa'!!! The wonder is, that after so *clear* an exposition, any thing more should ever have been said, sung, or written upon the subject."

Christians—if, instead of making a merit of swelling the number of things to be believed, and inventing pretences for denouncing and damning each other, men had been all that time equally zealous in provoking to the love of God, and of their fellow-creatures, what a comparatively happy world had it been; how instructive and animating, instead of disgraceful and revolting, had been the religious annals of mankind!

"Then, indeed, would a genuine unity have been transmitted to us, not depending upon the compulsory, or capricious, or impossible, adherence of men to a complicated system of belief—but flowing from a conviction, that holiness was the one thing needful, and charity the one thing lovely, in the religion of the Redeemer:—Varieties there would have been, but they would have been harmless; different ages and nations adopting different forms, but the bond of peace still sacred and unbroken; men of various capacities and temperaments indulging in opposite views of the less important intimations of Scripture, but forbearing to infringe upon the prerogative of a dissenting, or a weaker brother, knowing that every one must give an account OF HIMSELF before God—that to his own Master he standeth or falleth—and that, with whatever subordinate differences of opinion, all were entitled to the appellation of CHRISTIAN, and the privileges of religious communion, who, under God, took Christ for their MESSIAH, THEIR GUIDE, and THEIR JUDGE!"

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *May* 1, 1828.

ON Friday, April 4, was held the Annual Meeting of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society. The religious services were conducted in the Unitarian Chapel, Cross-Street, Manchester, by the Rev. J. Brettel of Rotherham; after which, a collection in aid of the funds of the Society took place, which amounted to £18. The members and friends of the Association, then assembled in the School-room of the Unitarian Meeting-House, Green Gate, Salford, to partake of refreshment, and transact the business of the Society. The Rev. J. G. Robberds presided. The report of the Committee, which was read, gave a pleasing account of the success, which, at Astley and Swinton, had attended upon the exertions of the stated missionary of the Association, the Rev. G. Buckland, aided by other ministers and gentlemen. The Society extends its influence to upwards of 400 children, and 200 adults. But its operations are considerably restricted by the deficiency of its resources; and previously to the annual meeting, the Committee had feared that the Association would be obliged to relinquish the highly valuable services of Mr. Buckland. On learning this, however, several individuals, present at the meeting, most generously increased their subscriptions, by which an augmentation of £25 per annum, was procured. Induced by this increase in their resources, the Society immediately appointed Mr. Buckland for another quarter, and earnestly recommended the Committee for the ensuing year, to make every exertion, in order, if possible, to continue Mr. Buckland in the situation which he fills with so much credit to himself, and usefulness to others. We hope that the benevolence of our fellow-Christians, will lead them to meet the earnest wishes of the Association.

THE anniversary of the opening of the Unitarian Meeting-House, Moor-Lane, Bolton, was held on Sunday and Monday, April the 6th and 7th, on which occasion, the Rev. H. H. Piper of Norton, and the Rev. J. R. Beard of Manchester, were the preachers. The collection, which took place for the liquidation of the debt incurred by the erection of school-rooms, amounted to £21. The members and friends, to the number of 110, dined together on the Monday: the Rev. H. H. Piper in the chair. The meeting was addressed by the Revds. H. H. Piper, J. R. Beard, J. Cropper (the minister of the congregation), E. Hawkes, H. Green, A. Bennet, G. Buckland, and by Messrs. T. Duffield, Barrow, F. B. Wright, and Brandreth. The utmost cordiality prevailed; the most liberal sentiments were uttered, and the highest gratification enjoyed. We have never attended a meeting in which the spirit of the Gospel was more prevalent. The congregation at Moor-Lane is of a character to secure the Christian sympathy of every friend to pure and vital religion, and there is every reason to hope, that, under the influences of their excellent pastor, and the spirit by which they are animated, they will succeed in establishing a permanent society, which must prove a blessing to themselves, and the district in which they are called to operate.

DURING the winter, a meeting for the discussion of controverted doctrines has been held in the School-room of the Unitarian Meeting-house, Green Gate, Salford. The subject that has chiefly occupied the attention, has been the Deity of Christ. The number of persons that has attended, amounts, at an average, to about two hundred. Each meeting was commenced with singing and prayer, and concluded with prayer alone. The chief speakers on the side of Unitarianism, were the Rev. J. R. Beard, Rev. G. Buckland, and Rev. A. Bennet. The books of the New Testament were taken consecutively in the order in which they stand, and the evidence which each singly affords, carefully considered. To this, which appears to us the only rational way of pursuing the inquiry, the Trinitarian speakers, though at first they acquiesced, afterwards greatly demurred; finding, we apprehend, that such a mode of investigation, was detrimental to the interests of the cause which they had undertaken to espouse. Upon the whole, the meetings have been conducted with great order, and with no inconsiderable degree of Christian spirit. But some degree of exertion was necessary on the part of the advocates of Unitarianism, in order to repress acrimonious, denunciatory, and pharasaical expressions from their dissentient friends. There is reason to think that much good has been effected by these meetings; and at least our Salford friends have the praise of obeying the injunction, "Cast thy bread upon the waters, and it shall be found after many days."

WE rejoice in stating, that a Meeting of the Inhabitants of Glasgow, friendly to Universal Religious Freedom, was called by public advertisement, and held in the Unitarian Chapel of this city, on the 28th March. It was both numerous and respectable, consisting of persons of various

denominations. Mr. Harris was the Chairman. The Resolutions were moved by Messrs. Muir and Blyth, and seconded by Mr. Thomson and Dr. Hindley, a Catholic. A Petition, founded on them, was unanimously adopted. Its prayer was for the *Unqualified* Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, as well as for the abrogation of all laws affecting liberty of thought on matters of religion. It specially objected to the Declaration in the Repeal Bill, as appearing to the Petitioners, "to retain the worst features of the original Statutes, and still to continue a reproach on those who conscientiously dissent from the Established Religion." The Petition received nearly FOUR THOUSAND signatures: several of them Ministers, some Episcopalians, a considerable number Catholics, and generally of the various religious parties of this country. We consider the number of signatures to this Petition, as a convincing proof of the progress of liberality. Numbers, even now, objected to sign it, on account of its having been proposed by the Unitarians; and we are satisfied, that, only a few years since, a very large proportion of the signatures would not have been obtained. The Petition has been presented to the House of Lords, by the Marquis of Lansdowne.

We observe, too, that the Repeal Bill has passed the Commons, as also the second reading in the Lords. We cannot conscientiously say, that we rejoice at its progress. It removes, indeed, the profanation of a solemn and affecting religious service, and so far we are glad—but it substitutes a trap for conscience, which virtually acknowledges the right of human power to interfere in Religion. In submitting to its introduction, the Dissenters have given up their vantage ground. Lord Russel affirmed, that the majority who voted with him, contemplated only the *unconditional* repeal. The Committee of the whole House passed a similar vote. And this was effected against the combined and strenuous efforts of Government. Seeing they could not prevent the Repeal, the only thing left was to clog it by restrictions. This, we think, has been effectually done by the Declaration. It is evident, that the Bishops and the Ministers consider it as an efficient security, greater even than that which has been lost. The Westminster Review has truly said, the past "History of the Dissenters is an instructive example of the fragility of any alliance which the oppressed may form with any body of oppressors—of the vanity of the sacrifice made by confiding patience to despotic will—and of the faithlessness of hierarchies, and courts, and kings." When the joy occasioned by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, has passed away, the Dissenters may, perhaps, acknowledge, that the Declaration in the Repeal Bill forms no exception to the observation.

True, had the just claim of the Dissenters been persisted in—had Lord Russel's original motion been carried forward—had no compromise taken place, these obnoxious statutes might not, this Session, have been swept away. But what then? Mrs. Barbauld said, in 1790, and the language is even more applicable now:—"The only question between us, is, whether you will do it to-day; to-morrow you certainly will. You will even entreat us, if need were, to allow you to remove from your country, the stigma of illiberality. We appeal to the certain, sure operation of increasing light and knowledge, which it is no more in your power to stop, than to repel the tide with your naked hand, or to wither with your breath, the genial influence of vegetation." "The genius of Philosophy [and of pure and undefiled Religion] is walking abroad, and with the touch of Ithuriel's spear, is trying the establishments of the earth. The various forms of Prejudice, Superstition, and Servility, start up in their true shapes, which had long imposed upon the world, under the revered semblances of Honour, Faith, and Loyalty. Whatever is loose, must be shaken; whatever is corrupt, must be lopt away; whatever is not built on the broad basis of public utility, must be thrown to the ground."

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 22. JUNE, 1828. Vol. II.

Matthew the Evangelist, a Unitarian.

(Continued from page 296.)

IT was my second object to show, that even the few passages which are thought by Trinitarians to relate to this subject, have, in fact, no relation to it whatever, and are misinterpreted when they are adduced as evidence to the doctrine of the Trinity, or the Deity of Jesus Christ.

The first which occurs, is the text, "And they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is, God with us."—Matt. i. 23.

On this verse, it may be remarked, that the more intelligent advocates of the Trinity make little or no account of it. In the mouths, however, of most people, it still passes for a most satisfactory proof-text on the doctrine of the Trinity. A few observations will suffice.

It seems to be generally admitted, that the words of Isaiah are not prophetical of Christ and the name and nature he should bear, but are to be confined to the immediate event of which the Prophet was then speaking; and that the Evangelist refers to the event recorded by the Prophet, only as applying remarkably to, and suiting the circumstances of the Saviour's birth and office. Ahaz king of Judah, was in fear for his kingdom, the two kings of Syria and Israel having come up against him, and God promised Ahaz that before a child, [illegible] to be born, should be grown up, after whose name it was spoken of the intended deliverance, should be called Immanuel, *i. e.* God with us, the two kingdoms of his enemies should be overthrown. God would be with him, *i. e.* give him the victory over his enemies. Jesus having come as the messenger of God to save mankind from their greatest enemy, sin, the Evangelist recollecting the incident in the history of Ahaz, introduces it in illustration of his subject. But as God did not come on earth in his own person, to interpose in behalf of Ahaz, so neither does the Evangelist intend to convey the idea that because he applies the name Em-

manuel to Jesus, that he had come in his own person to save mankind from their sins.

But the true answer to any argument drawn from this verse in favour of the Deity of Christ, and the only one which it requires, is found in the circumstance, that it was a customary thing among the Jews to give to their children significant names; and very often such as were composed in part, of the word God; *e. g.* Elijah, means God the Lord—Lemuel, God with them—Elihu, God himself—Mathathias, given of God; and so on. So that there is no more evidence to be derived from the name, that Jesus was God because he was called Emmanuel, than there is from the circumstance, that because men have been named Elijah, &c. that they were each therefore God, by a mysterious union with the divine nature.

But supposing the prophecy to have the strictest application to Jesus, we say that he was called Emmanuel, not in reference to his *nature*, but the office he was to sustain, and the abundant communications of the Spirit of God with which he was to be favoured. In this respect he was indeed Emmanuel. God was with him by the miracles which he wrought, by the prophecies which he uttered, by the doctrines he held forth, and as really as if he had been personally united to the man Jesus.

The next is in Matt. ix. 2. "He saith to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee." Hence, Trinitarians infer that Jesus was God; for none can forgive sin but he. To this it is enough to reply, that the authority to forgive sins, was as easy and natural a power to be conferred on the Saviour as any other, and proves him to be God no more than does every other exercise of miraculous power. Besides, the Apostles had power to forgive sins. To them our Lord said, "whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Were the Apostles Gods?

Matt. xi. 27. "All things are delivered unto me by my Father; and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him." If the knowledge which Jesus is here said to have of God, implies Omniscience and Deity on his part, the implication is extended, let it be observed, to *those to whom the Son shall reveal him*—Supreme Deity is ascribed as much to them as to Jesus; that is, it is not to either.

Besides, the first part of this verse, in terms, denies the doctrine it is brought to support:—"All things are *given* unto me by my Father." The receiver is not the same as the one who gives, any more than the sender can be the same as the sent.

Matt. xviii. 20. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;" and chap. xxviii. 20. "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world," are commonly adduced as declaring Christ's Omnipresence, and thence his Supreme Deity. It is not easy to reply seriously to argument like this. These passages have not the most distant relation to the subject. Our Lord, in these verses, merely expresses—according to a universal licence, a beautiful and universal form of language—his interest and affection for his disciples; for the presence of which he speaks, whatever it be, is confined to them. How often do we say to our absent friends, "Though away from you, consider us as present,"—"Our hearts are with you,"—"In spirit we are among you?" Paul says to the Corinthians, writing from Ephesus, "when ye are gathered together, and my spirit," &c. Had Paul the attribute of Omnipresence? Was Paul God?

Chap. xxviii. 19. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Since the text of the three heavenly witnesses has been abandoned by the intelligent and honest of all parties, as indisputably a forgery, this is the stronghold of the doctrine of the Trinity; for, unless I greatly err, it is the only instance, save the form of benediction in the Epistles, in which the supposed persons of the Trinity are mentioned together. And how can that doctrine claim our faith or our respect, which is so supported? Is it to be believed, that so tremendous a mystery would have been left at such loose ends by the sacred writers, had they believed it? But, in regard to the text before us, how, you ask, does it teach the doctrine of the Trinity? That doctrine teaches, that three Divine and Infinite Beings or Gods, are yet but one—that one God is three! These points, it is most manifest, are not proved by the text. Nothing is said of the equality of the persons named; it is not said that the Holy Ghost is a person; it is not said that they are one and yet three, or three and yet one; all of which ought to be said, to warrant the use

that orthodoxy makes of it. But if these things are so, in what way is the doctrine of the Trinity derived from it, even by inference? Thus: It is said in the first place, that because these three persons (allowing them all to be persons) are *named together*, they must be equal; and therefore, each God. But this is an absurdity; for in Exod. xiv. 31, it is written, "And the people believed the Lord, and his servant Moses."—Is Moses God? "And all the people feared the Lord and Samuel."*—Is Samuel thus proved to be equal to God? "And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king."†—Are they equal because named together, and, in the Scripture use of the word, worshipped together? Paul says to Timothy, "I charge you before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that ye observe these things."‡—Are the angels Gods? Just as mistaken and childish as these inferences would be, is that which Trinitarians make from the verse in question, of the equality of the three persons named in it.

But once more, the Deity of Jesus and the doctrine of a Trinity is inferred from this passage, because it is thought that *Baptism* must necessarily be into the name of God, or of a Divine Being equal to him. But not so; for Paul speaks of the Israelites being "baptised into Moses," who certainly was not God, or his equal, though he was *called* a God to Pharaoh. The same Apostle, writing to the Corinthians, says—"Is Christ divided, was Paul crucified for you, or were you baptised into the name of Paul? I thank God I baptised none of you, save Crispus and Gaius, lest any one should say I baptised into my own name." Some, therefore, imagined that Paul might abuse his power, and baptise into his own name. But did they believe Paul to be God? It is, therefore, no evidence that the persons named in the text are Divine, because baptism is administered in their names.

The true and whole meaning of the verse, is, "Go forth and make disciples of all nations, baptising the converts into the belief of that religion which was the gift of God, through his Son Jesus Christ, and which was confirmed by the Holy Spirit, or miraculous powers bestowed on the Apostles, on the day of Pentecost." Let it be remem-

---

* 1 Sam. xii. 18. † 1 Chron. xxix. 20. ‡ 1 Tim. v. 24.

bered, in this connexion, that no weight was attached to this form by the Apostles, though so much is now-a-days; for they never used it, always baptising into the name of Jesus alone. But if they had thought that so solemn and essential a doctrine as the Trinity was contained in those words of the Saviour, they would scarce have felt authorised to depart from them.

Such is the testimony of Matthew to the doctrine of the Trinity.*

And is it credible, that *such* a doctrine should be left to rest on *such* support? Is it to be believed that an inspired Apostle should have written what he doubtless regarded a full account of all the essential peculiarities of the religion of Jesus, and have passed over in such silence, its most remarkable one? Nay, as will be seen, should have recorded sayings of our Lord, utterly contradictory of it, which wholly refute and deny it? Which must be expunged from the Gospel, before it can be admitted to be true?

Let me now, as was proposed, in the third place, bring forward the direct and indirect evidence of St. Matthew to the Unity of God, and the derived power of Jesus Christ.

I shall not pretend to adduce the whole body of proof of this description, since it would be to transcribe the greater part of the Gospel.

Every instance in which the singular pronouns are used in connexion with the name of God, is a proof of his Unity. This universal usage throughout the Bible is a demonstration of it. Every instance in which Jesus is spoken of as a man, with human feeling and affection, acting, speaking, suffering, and at last dying as a man, is an argument in behalf of his derived nature. Every prayer which he offered up to God, every reference to him as *his* God as well as ours, is a complete demonstration of the Supremacy of the Father, and the dependence of Jesus; unless we are willing to believe that our Saviour went through the mockery of praying to himself; that one person of the sacred three was obliged to solicit favour and assistance from the others, which he was as able

* With respect to Mat. xxviii. 9, it is enough to refer to xviii. 26; Acts x. 25; 1 Chron. xxix. 20;—and of xxii. 41, &c. to say, that the difficulty with the Jews, in answering our Lord's question, arose wholly and obviously from their having no conception of the *spiritual* nature of Christ's kingdom.

to procure himself, as they to bestow, and which, indeed, an Infinite Being could not need.

Jesus says, chap. iv. 10, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Therefore God is but one; for if Jesus had been God, he must have also been an object of worship as such.—xix. 17, Our Saviour says to the young man, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God." Whatever he meant by the term good, our Lord says there is no second being to whom it can be applied in the same sense in which it is applicable to God. Therefore our Saviour did not regard himself as God. It is an explicit denial that he was so. He absolutely refuses a title which he conceived could be used with propriety only in relation to the Supreme God. This marked and instantaneous rejection of a title so modest and humble, shows, I think, a determination to repress, in the beginning, every disposition to bestow upon him extravagant honours, and which the wonderful powers he possessed would be so likely to draw from them. The *sensitiveness*, as it may without impropriety be termed, which our Lord discovers on this occasion, is worth a chapter of direct assertions, in proof of his derived and inferior nature.

(To be Continued.)

"*Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, occasioned by the publication of Scott's Life of Napoleon.*"

(Continued from page 306.)

"A still more fatal influence of the spirit of self-exaggeration which characterised Bonaparte, remains to be named. It depraved to an extraordinary degree his moral sense. It did not obliterate altogether the ideas of duty, but, by a singular perversion, it impelled him to apply them exclusively to others. It never seemed to enter his thought, that he was subject to the great obligations of morality, which all others are called to respect. He was an exempted being. Whatever stood in his way to empire, he was privileged to remove. Treaties only bound his enemies. No nation had rights but his own France. He claimed a monopoly in perfidy and violence. He was not naturally cruel; but when human life obstructed his progress, it was a lawful prey, and murder and assassination occasioned as little compunction as war. The most luminous exposition of his moral code, was given in his counsels to the king of Holland. 'Never forget, that in the situation to which my political system and the interests of my empire

have called you, your first duty is towards ME—your second towards France. All your other duties, even those towards the people whom I have called you to govern, rank after these.' To his own mind he was the source and centre of duty. He was too peculiar and exalted, to be touched by that vulgar stain, called guilt. Crimes ceased to be such, when perpetrated by himself. Accordingly, he always speaks of his transgressions as of indifferent acts. He never imagined that they tarnished his glory, or diminished his claim on the homage of the world. In St. Helena, though talking perpetually of himself, and often reviewing his guilty career, we are not aware that a single compunction escapes him. He speaks of his life as calmly as if it had been consecrated to duty and beneficence, whilst in the same breath he has the audacity to reproach unsparingly the faithlessness of almost every individual and nation, with whom he had been connected. We doubt whether history furnishes so striking an example of the moral blindness and obduracy to which an unbounded egotism exposes and abandons the mind.

"His spirit of self-exaggeration was seen in his openness to adulation. Policy, indeed, prompted him to put his praises into the mouths of the venal slaves, who administered his depotism. But flattery would not have been permitted to swell into exaggerations, now nauseous, now ludicrous, and now impious, if, in the bosom of the chief, there had not lodged a flatterer who sounded a louder note of praise than all around him. He was remarkably sensitive to opinion, and resented as a wrong the suppression of his praises. The press of all countries was watched, and free states were called upon to curb it for daring to take liberties with his name. Even in books published in France on general topics, he expected a recognition of his authority. Works of talent were suppressed, when their authors refused to offer incense at the new shrine. He wished indeed to stamp his name on the literature, as on the legislation, policy, warfare of his age, and to compel genius, whose pages survive statues, columns, and empires, to take a place among his tributaries.

"We close our view of Bonaparte's character, by saying, that his original propensities, released from restraint, and pampered by indulgence, to a degree seldom allowed to mortals, grew up into a spirit of despotism as stern and absolute as ever usurped the human heart. The love of power and supremacy, absorbed—consumed him. No other passion, no domestic attachment, no private friendship, no love of pleasure, no relish for letters or the arts, no human sympathy, no human weakness, divided his mind with the passion for dominion and for dazzling manifestations of his power. Before this, duty, honour, love, humanity, fell prostrate. Josephine, we are told, was dear to him; but the devoted wife, who had stood firm and faithful in the day of his doubtful fortunes, was cast off in his prosperity, to make room for a stranger, who might be more subservient to his power. He was affectionate, we are told, to his brothers and mother; but his brothers, the moment they ceased to be his tools, were disgraced; and his mother, it is said, was not allowed to sit in the presence of her

imperial son.* He was sometimes softened, we are told, by the sight of the field of battle strewn with the wounded and dead. But if the Moloch of his ambition claimed new heaps of slain to-morrow, it was never denied. With all his sensibility, he gave millions to the sword, with as little compunction as he would have brushed away so many insects, which had infested his march. To him, all human will, desire, power, were to bend. His superiority, none might question. He insulted the fallen, who had contracted the guilt of opposing his progress; and not even woman's loveliness, and the dignity of a queen, could give shelter from his contumely. His allies were his vassals, nor was their vassalage concealed. Too lofty to use the arts of conciliation, preferring command to persuasion, overbearing, and all-grasping, he spread distrust, exasperation, fear, and revenge through Europe; and when the day of retribution came, the old antipathies and mutual jealousies of nations, were swallowed up in one burning purpose to prostrate the common tyrant, the universal foe.

"Such was Napoleon Bonaparte. But some will say, he was still a great man. This we mean not to deny. But we would have it understood, that there are various kinds or orders of greatness, and that the highest did not belong to Bonaparte. There are different orders of greatness. Among these the first rank is unquestionably due to *moral* greatness, or magnanimity; to that sublime energy, by which the soul, smitten with the love of virtue, binds itself indissolubly, for life and for death, to truth and duty; espouses as its own the interests of human nature; scorns all meanness and defies all peril; hears in its own conscience a voice louder than threatenings and thunders; withstands all the powers of the universe, which would sever it from the cause of freedom, virtue, and religion; reposes an unfaltering trust in God in the darkest hour, and is ever 'ready to be offered up' on the altar of its country or of mankind. Of this moral greatness, which throws all other forms of greatness into obscurity, we see not a trace or spark in Napoleon. Though clothed with the power of a God, the thought of consecrating himself to the introduction of a new and higher era, to the exaltation of the character and condition of his race, seems never to have dawned on his mind. The spirit of disinterestedness and self-sacrifice seems not to have waged a moment's war with self-will and ambition. His ruling passions, indeed, were singularly at variance with magnanimity. Moral greatness has too much simplicity, is too unostentatious, too self-subsistent, and enters into others' interests with too much heartiness, to live a day for what Napoleon always lived, to make itself the theme, and gaze, and wonder of a dazzled world.—Next to moral, comes *intellectual* greatness, or genius in the highest sense of that word; and by this, we mean that sublime capacity of thought, through which the soul, smitten with the love of the

* See 'America,' page 57. We should not give this very unamiable trait of Napoleon's domestic character, but on authority which we cannot question.

true and the beautiful, essays to comprehend the universe, soars into the heavens, penetrates the earth, penetrates itself, questions the past, anticipates the future, traces out the general and all-comprehending laws of nature, binds together by innumerable affinities and relations all the objects of its knowledge, and, not satisfied with what exists and with what is finite, frames to itself ideal excellence, loveliness, and grandeur. This is the greatness which belongs to philosophers, inspired poets, and to the master spirits in the fine arts.—Next comes the greatness of *action;* and by this we mean the sublime power of conceiving and executing bold and extensive plans; of constructing and bringing to bear on a mighty object, a complicated machinery of means, energies, and arrangements, and of accomplishing great outward effects. To this head belongs the greatness of Bonaparte, and that he possessed it, we need not prove, and none will be hardy enough to deny. A man, who raised himself from obscurity to a throne, who changed the face of the world, who made himself felt through powerful and civilized nations, who sent the terror of his name across seas and oceans, whose will was pronounced and feared as destiny, whose donatives were crowns, whose antechamber was thronged by submissive princes, who broke down the awful barrier of the Alps and made them a highway, and whose fame was spread beyond the boundaries of civilization to the steppes of the Cossack, and the deserts of the Arab; a man, who has left this record of himself in history, has taken out of our hands the question, whether he shall be called great. All must concede to him a sublime power of action, an energy equal to great effects.

"We are not disposed, however, to consider him as pre-eminent even in this order of greatness. War was his chief sphere. He gained his ascendency in Europe by the sword. But war is not the field for the highest active talent, and Napoleon, we suspect, was conscious of this truth. The glory of being the greatest general of his age, would not have satisfied him. He would have scorned to take his place by the side of Marlborough or Turenne. It was as the founder of an empire, which threatened for a time to comprehend the world, and which demanded other talents besides that of war, that he challenged unrivalled fame. And here we question his claim. Here we cannot award him supremacy. The project of universal empire, however imposing, was not original. The revolutionary governments of France had adopted it before; nor can we consider it as a sure indication of greatness, when we remember that the weak and vain mind of Louis XIV. was large enough to cherish it. The question is, Did Napoleon bring to this design the capacity of advancing it by bold and original conceptions, adapted to an age of civilization, and of singular intellectual and moral excitement? Did he discover new foundations of power? Did he frame new bonds of union for subjugated nations? Did he discover, or originate, some common interests by which his empire might be held together? Did he breathe a spirit which should supplant the old national attachments, or did he invent any substitutes for those vulgar instruments of force and

corruption, which any and every usurper would have used? Never in the records of time, did the world furnish such materials to work with, such means of modelling nations afresh, of building up a new power, of introducing a new era, as did Europe at the period of the French revolution. Never was the human mind so capable of new impulses. And did Napoleon prove himself equal to the condition of the world? Do we detect one original conception in his means of universal empire? Did he seize on the enthusiasm of his age, that powerful principle, more efficient than arms or policy, and bend it to his purpose? What did he do but follow the beaten track? but apply force and fraud in their very coarsest forms? Napoleon showed a vulgar mind, when he assumed self-interest as the sole spring of human action. With the sword in one hand and bribes in the other, he imagined himself absolute master of the human mind. The strength of moral, national, and domestic feeling, he could not comprehend. The finest, and after all, the most powerful elements in human nature, hardly entered into his conceptions of it; and how, then, could he have established a durable power over the human race? We want little more to show his want of originality and comprehensiveness as the founder of an empire, than the simple fact, that he chose as his chief counsellors Talleyrand and Fouche, names which speak for themselves. We may judge of the greatness of the master spirit, from the minds which he found most congenial with his own. In war, Bonaparte was great; for he was bold, original, and creative. Beyond the camp he indeed showed talent, but not superior to that of other eminent men.

(To be Continued.)

On Truth: a Fragment.

(Continued from page 261.)

Would *ye* enkindle in your breasts, *like* fires?
A future age bequeath *like* precious boon?
Strive, then, by deeds, to emulate your sires,
In love of Truth and Freedom! Learn to attune
Your souls, to breathe with theirs harmonious; soon
Will resplendent light, from that high converse caught,
Spread o'er your lives a lustre—like the moon
Imbued with solar rays, throws o'er the earth—fraught
With high praise to God—towards man, ennobling thought!

What stirr'd those holy men to strife of blood?
Whence sprung the wrongs that roused them to the fight,
Which woke each cavern'd voice—each mountain flood
Dyed with ensanguined hue—and 'thwart the night,

From crag to tower pass'd on the bale-fire's light?
Whence? From the bigot's dull and stagnant soul!
The venal arm of mercenary might,
Deeming, of strength, to reach the worthless goal
Of tyranny—mind thrall'd beneath a Thrall's control!

But ye were met, and grappled with, and baffled,
By those proud, stern, high-minded men of yore!
The blood pour'd out, like rain, on hearth and scaffold—
A Nation, weltering in her children's gore—
Call'd for redress—and retribution saw!
Then, martyr'd Hamilton,* thy dying breath—
A pillar'd flame—that patriot band, before,
To seal their faith, led on, to victory or death!
Truth's standard to uprear—or fall enshrined beneath!

Thy name—thou noble youth—is justly great!
'Tis not thy proud descent, thy blazon'd roll
Of princely ancestry†—'tis not the state,
And royal pomp, that bent to thy control,—
It is thy true nobility of soul
That wakes our reverence, and gives thy name
The power of a spell, across our lives, to toll
The knell of selfishness, and rouse the same
High thoughts that glow'd in *thee*, so pure and bright a flame!

How 'long the dim, drear, shadowy stretch of past—
A dubious gloom—flickers the lurid gleams,
From thy fierce-flaring martyr-pile, becast!
Into how bold reliev', the ruddy beams
Throw out, each rite, and monstrous pile, that teems
Abomination—superstition-propp'd!
Oh! well, upon that beacon, it beseems
We fix our strong regards;—ne'er be they dropp'd
From that bright landmark of our rights, till heart be stopp'd!

---

* For a deeply interesting account of Patrick Hamilton, see M'Crie's Life of Knox, Vol. I. p. 28, 29, 30.

† His father, Sir Patrick Hamilton of Kincavil, was a son of Lord Hamilton, who married a sister of King James III. His mother was a daughter of John, Duke of Albany, brother to the same monarch.—*Pink. Hist. Scot.* What is more interesting to know, is, that "he expired with these words in his mouth, 'How long, O Lord, shall darkness cover this realm? How long wilt thou suffer this tyranny of men? Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.'"

Thou wert a fit precursor to the band
That foremost press'd, the blood-indented print
Thy footsteps traced!—Young Kennedy,* thy sand
Of life was soon run out, nor didst thou stint
The tide—though e'en the bigot's heart of flint
Thy early blight might mourn—with life to part,
Dress'd out so gay, with many a varied tint!
Thy path was proudly heralded, George Wishart,
By such, with Russel meek, to him fair counterpart!

And many a name beside, to liberty
Endear'd, fills up that crimson'd roll of crime!
Straiton, and Norman Gourlay,† ye shall be,
With Henry Forrest,‡ number'd in my rhyme:
Bright names are ye, the oblivious stream of time
Shall ne'er efface, from memory of the land
That ranks ye 'midst her sons; but whilst, sublime,
Piercing the vault of heaven, her cliffs shall stand,
Ye shall receive the meed of praise your deeds demand!

But there are wrongs, that crush the human heart,
With sorer weight than blazing faggots' doom:—
These scorch the body only,—but to part
From country and home—oh! this is to consume,
With lingering agony, the soul! The tomb,
To exile's fate, a smiling aspect wears—
Though air and light we leave, for damp and gloom!
So thought'st thou, George Buchanan! through thy tears,
Eyeing thy native land, receding with thy fears.

Sad presage for a nation's weal, to see
Her noblest leave her, for a nobler land!
And such were ye, young Aless and Macbee,
Where all were noble, noblest of the band,

---

* I extract the following, from Note H, to Vol. I. of M'Crie's Knox: "In 1538, two young men, of the most interesting characters, suffered with the greatest heroism, at Glasgow. The one was Jerom Russel, a cordelier friar, 'a young man of a meek nature, quick spirit, and of good letteres;' the other was a young gentleman of the name of Kennedy, only eighteen years of age, and 'of excellent ingyne for Scottish poetry.'"

† "David Straiton was a gentleman, and brother to the laird of Lauriston. He was instructed in the Protestant principles by Erskine of Dun. In 1534, he was committed to the flames, at Greenside, in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh. His fellow-sufferer, Norman Gourlay, was in secular orders, and 'a man of reasonabell eruditioun.'"—*M'Crie's Knox.*

‡ "Henry Forrest suffered at St. Andrews, in 1530, for possessing a copy of the New Testament, and affirming that Patrick Hamilton was a true martyr."—*M'Crie's Knox.*

Who left their father—for a foreign—strand!*
Seatoun, Macdowal, Fife, and John Mackbray,
Guillaume, Gawin Logie, John Rough, and
Richardson,† from Scotia wend their way, [day!‡
And Denmark, Germany, the Alps, welcome the spring of

But chiefly thou,§ bright morning-star of truth,
That proudly took'st thy station in the van
Of martyrs—a sage 'midst saints—in years, a youth—
Did'st herald HIM, whose epitaph thus ran:
"There lies *he*, who never fear'd the face of man!"‖
He, who through death, and peril, and the mocks
And taunts of hireling foes, wielded the "fan"
That *purged* the Christian Church! amidst which shocks
Of strife, thou held'st fast thy integrity, John Knox.¶

---

* "Alexander Aless was a canon of the Metropolitan Church of St. Andrews. Being a young man of quick parts, and well versed in scholastic theology, and having studied the Lutheran controversy, he undertook to reclaim Patrick Hamilton from heresy, and held several conferences with him for that purpose. But instead of this, he was himself staggered by the reasoning of that gentleman. His doubts were greatly strengthened by the constancy with which he saw Hamilton adhere to his sentiments to the last, amidst the scorn, rage, and cruelty of his enemies." How justly may it be said of Hamilton, that "the blood of the martyr became the seed of the church."—*M'Crie's Knox.*

† Of these names, it is sufficient to say, that they belonged to men, driven by persecution from their native land. Who that has read, can fail of applying to these sufferers in the good cause of truth and freedom, these fearless vindicators of the "rights of man," the fine stanza of Byron, on Julia Alpinula, on visiting, "By a lone wall, a lonelier column," rearing "A grey and grief-worn aspect of old days?"—

"But these are deeds which should not pass away,
And names that must not wither, though the earth
Forgets her empires with a just decay—
The enslavers and the enslaved, their death and birth;
The high and mountain-majesty of worth
Should be, and shall, survivor of its woe;
And from its immortality look forth,
In the sun's face, like yonder Alpine snow,
Imperishably pure beyond all things below."

‡ "Whereby the day-spring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness, to guide our feet into the way of peace."—Luke i. 78, 79.

§ Patrick Hamilton.

‖ "On Wednesday, the 26th November, he was interred in the Churchyard of St. Giles. His funeral was attended by the newly-elected Regent, Morton, by all the nobility who were in the city, and a great concourse of people. When his body was laid in the grave, the Regent emphatically pronounced his eulogium, in the well-known words—'There lies *he*, who never feared the face of man.'"—*M'Crie's Knox.*

¶ "The most disinterested of the nobility who were embarked with him in the same cause, sacrificed, on some occasions, the public good to their private interests, and disappointed the hopes which he had formed

"*A Letter to the Protestant Dissenters in the Parish of Ballykelly, Ireland, occasioned by their objections to their late Minister.—By John Nelson.*"

(Continued from page 189.)

"You complain that I do not bind parents to educate their children in the principles of the Confession of Faith. But why should this be complained of—what divine authority have the Ministers of the Gospel to engage Christians to any principles by a promise or oath? Is it not the duty of every person to embrace the truth when and wherever he finds it, and to adhere to this alone? What security can any industrious upright man have, that he will not change some of his opinions? It will be allowed, at least in words, that the authors of the Westminster Confession, as well as of all other human creeds, were fallible men—that they may have been mistaken. And what if we should find out some of their mistakes? In such a case, can a thousand former oaths bind us to believe what we see to be false, or to practise what we know to be wrong? None surely will imagine they can. There is no heresy, I hope, in affirming, that we ought to believe and obey God rather than man. Such vows, then, amount to nothing. Accordingly, where do we find in the Bible, a command for such a practice, or an example to favour it?"

"Our Lord generally enforces his precepts, by turning men's attention to the happiness arising from the observance of them. Instead of swearing men to obey him, he commonly concluded his instructions with something to this purpose,—*My yoke is easy, my burden is light;* or, *If ye know these things, happy are ye, if ye do them.* His Apostles addressed themselves to men in the same strain. We find them exhorting their hearers to become Christians, without a word of *binding* them by any promise or vow: Acts ii. 38, 'Repent, and be baptised every one of you,

---

of them. The most upright of his associates in the ministry, relaxed their exertions, or suffered themselves, at times, to be drawn into measures that were unsuitable to their station, and hurtful to the reformed religion. But, from the time that the standard of Truth was first raised by Knox, in his native country, till it dropped from his hands at death, he never shrunk from danger, never consulted his own ease or advantage, never entered into any compromise with the enemy, never was bribed or frightened into cowardly silence; but, keeping his eye singly and steadily fixed on the advancement of religion and liberty, supported throughout the character of the Reformer of Scotland."—*M'Crie's Knox.*

in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Is it farther necessary to produce the instance of the Ethiopian Eunuch to the same purpose? 'And the Eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? and Philip said, If thou BELIEVEST with all thine heart, thou MAYEST. And he answered, and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went both down into the water.—And he baptized him.' Now, if there be neither precept nor instance in Sacred Writ, of binding men to any thing upon administering the *sign* of the covenant of grace, is it not unreasonable and unscriptural in you to be greatly offended, because I do not call upon Christians to make any promise or vow upon this occasion? Should you not with great firmness, refuse any human invention, if it was offered to you? Upon this principle, the first Reformers acted. Without this, there never could have been a Reformation. Upon the same principle, those illustrious men, called Puritans, bravely rejected the spiritual tyranny of the Church of England, when, through the ambition and covetousness of the leading clergy, working upon the mistaken policy of weak princes, this Church deserted the cause of liberty, and adopted maxims of an opposite nature. These Christian heroes, the first Protestant dissenters, when oppressed by unjust power, sooner than destroy the ground and pillar of all reformation, sooner than relapse into the principles of Popery, *went out* from their livings like the faithful Abraham, *not knowing whither they went.* If these venerable spirits were to visit this lower world, with what deep concern would they behold their degenerate posterity, still indeed wearing the same name, but generally gone aside from that glorious cause which they espoused at the peril of their lives—the cause of Religious Liberty; and endeavouring to introduce or support the very soul of Popery—spiritual slavery! Are not such characters, in their distinguishing excellences, worthy of imitation? If you or I should practise or submit to any particular of our own or other men's invention in religion, may we not justly expect, that our Judge will

* How short and clear was this creed, compared with a modern Confession of Faith. How may we admire the superior wisdom of Philip's successors!

ask, with a voice more solemn than the distant thunder's roar, Who hath required this at your hand? Will it be a sufficient answer, that this has been practised, perhaps enjoined, by a whole national Church, or more? How? has not the Judge and Governor of all, plainly instructed us what to do in such circumstances? Exod. xxiii. 2, 'Thou shalt not follow a MULTITUDE to do evil, neither shalt thou speak in a cause, to decline after MANY to wrest judgment.' Has he not clearly informed us, that in religion the *commandments of men* are utterly *vain* and unacceptable to him? The reason is obvious: every thing of this kind is, in effect, raising our wisdom above his; which is highly impious.

"Without any disrespect to the Assembly in Scotland, or the Synod in Ireland, it may be affirmed, that it is of no consequence whether they have made it a rule to *bind* Christians to any thing at the baptism of their children. The only question worth attending to, is, whether there be such a rule in the Bible. The Word of God, with every consistent Protestant, is the only and all-sufficient rule of faith and religious obedience. Will any number of men in Scotland, Ireland, or elsewhere, make such high pretensions as to be Lords of our consciences? What? to be Gods upon earth! if they did, words are wanting to express how sincerely they ought to be despised. Whenever any national Church departs from the wisdom of the All-comprehending Mind, and in the place thereof substitutes its own folly, is there any more regard due to it in such particulars, than to the Church of Rome? Has not the old Mother Church an equal claim to infallibility, and an equal right to enact laws, with any of her offspring? In a word, where are men invested with authority to make new laws in the Church of Christ? If this question can be answered in the affirmative, then farewell Liberty; welcome Popery, with all the absurdity, superstition, and trumpery, of this monument of human vanity! But though this claim has been often made and exercised, yet a right to do so has never been shown by the most ingenious cheats that have undertaken to prove it: and it may be presumed, while the New Testament is in any esteem at all, or while men are acquainted with the frame of their own minds, and the unalienable rights of human nature, it never will. From all which, it evidently follows, that unless there be divine authority for

binding parents by promises of any sort at the baptism of their children, nothing of this kind ought to be done. But such authority, it has been shown, there is not: and therefore the practice is unwarrantable."

(To be Continued.)

Memoir of the Rev. James Scott.

(Concluded from page 309.)

THE judgment of Mr. Scott was sound, and his perceptions were clear. He bestowed much care on his compositions for the pulpit; so that they might be plain, methodical, intelligible, pertinent, scriptural, and impressive: nor did he fail of accomplishing his purpose. As became a wise and faithful teacher, he availed himself of seasons, and of circumstances, and of special occasions, for the selection of fit topics of address; nor overlooked, in this or in any respect, the wants and the improvement of his various hearers. His devotional services were uniformly simple in style, and unaffected in manner; and in the sentiments which they conveyed, characteristically reverential, adoring, grateful, contrite, submissive, and benevolent.

He was distinguished by considerable regularity in the arrangement of his time, nor least of his hours of study. A part of every day was reserved by him for the perusal of the Scriptures in the original languages, and for the devotional, practical, ecclesiastical, and biographical reading, so congenial to his taste. On subjects of theological controversy, he thought for himself, and frankly laid before his audiences the result of his inquiries; making his appeal to the Sacred Writings, as the only authoritative standard of divine truth,* and calling upon others to use the same guide and test. I have scarcely ever known a man of such genuine candour: assuredly, I have met with none more candid.† His pure mind soared above the mists of selfishness, to a more serene and exalted region. When good could be done, *by any instrumentality*, to the bodies and the souls of men, he was among the first to welcome and encourage the attempt.

* Supplement to a Letter to Foley, &c. p. 41.

† Richard Baxter "said to a friend, '*I can as willingly be a martyr for love, as for any article of the creed:*'" this, too, was uniformly the language of Mr. Scott's character and deportment.

The excellence of his private character was most auspicious to his public usefulness. He was, in an uncommon degree, holy, harmless, undefiled—speaking evil of no man, reluctant to believe evil of any man, and extremely studious of giving no occasion of offence. "In his intercourse with the world, he kept himself in a peculiar manner free from the follies and sins with which it so much abounds: conciliating all, of every rank, and of every religious communion, by the kindness of his manners, and engaging the best affections of those who sought his friendship, by the advice and assistance which he was ever ready to afford, by the interest which he took in their welfare, by the pleasure which their success afforded him, by the valuable encouragement which he would give to their virtuous efforts."*

Not only at Stourbridge, and at Cradley, did Mr. Scott labour, in the Christian ministry, with great acceptance and success as well as zeal. To other and humbler spots—to one spot in particular—he as duly resorted with not less willing feet. More than thirty-five years have fled away, since he began to preach the Gospel to the poor, in a hamlet where the name of *religion* was almost unknown—or known only to be the theme of profane jests and vulgar ridicule. Though at that time a "young man,"† he was "good," devout, conciliating, judicious, and persevering; and, having subdued much difficulty and opposition, he became God's favoured instrument in producing what I may call *a moral creation.* Many individuals—not a few, who through his instructions, have departed hence in faith, and peace, and hope, and others who survive and adorn their doctrine—were the witnesses and the subjects of this happy change; so that he was blessed and venerated by those who once thought lightly of his office, and even in-

---

* Address at the Interment, &c. Dec. 26, 1827, by Alexander Paterson, M. A.

In language which correctly describes a late eminent and amiable minister, it may be said of Mr. Scott, that "the efficacy of his ministry was never obstructed nor impaired by the personal prejudices of his hearers, who regarded him not only with the deference due to a zealous and enlightened teacher, but with the affection of a friend. He was an ardent lover of peace. On no occasion did he offend by haughtiness, negligence, the indulgence of a capricious humour, or the sallies of intemperate anger."—*Memoir of the Rev. T. N. Toller, by Robert Hall, M. A. p.* 61.

† The words marked with inverted commas, are those of Dr. Priestley. Appeal to the Public, &c. Part II. p. 203, Appendix No. XIX. The date of that volume (1792) should be carefully recollected.

sulted his person. Nor can the populous and important neighbourhood in which he lived, forget that he was the first who brought Christian light to those abodes of darkness—the first whose wise, disinterested, pious efforts carried thither the means of *civilization*, by carrying to them the *religion* which teaches us, "that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live righteously, soberly, and devoutly, in this present world, looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ."*

In addition to his numerous and important labours of love, whether by his advice, by his bounty, or by his influence, whether in the management of trusts on the behalf of the families of his deceased friends, or in his attentions to the widow, the fatherless, the sick, the penitent, the dying, the aged, and the young, or by writing or editing many a useful or pious manual,† he undertook the office

* The principal scene of these well directed labours, was *The Lye Waste*, in the extensive parish of Old Swinford. This spot, which, probably, received its name from its wild uncultivated state, and its contiguity to a sylvan pasture, adjoins closely to the hamlet of the *Lye*, and, according to some representations, had, even in 1650, a few scattered cottages on its surface. Considering it, perhaps, in the light of common and *waste* ground, numerous vagrants took possession of it; nor was it then intersected by any road, or in the vicinity of well-peopled districts of the parish. At present, it consists of many tenements, occupied chiefly by nailers, and stands on the high road from Birmingham to Stourbridge.

It is probable, that, from various causes, the inhabitants of the Lye Waste had a still worse reputation than they deserved. Yet they were miserably uncivilized, and really, as well as to a proverb, rude and lawless; being thus unhappily distinguished from the neighbouring villages. For more than thirty years past, (such is the change!) *the Waste* has not been, in the least degree, remarkable for producing riotous assemblages, even in times of local commotion.

On this neglected spot, there was no accommodation for public worship previously to 1790; and the parish church is distant, and quite inadequate to the population. Amidst many difficulties, Mr. James Scott, from 1790 and 1792, conducted divine service in licensed dwelling-houses: in the year 1806 (Month. Repos. &c. Vol. I. p. 52), he opened a small chapel; advancing, towards the erection of it, the sum of £200, which his late aunt, Mrs. Ann Scott (Month. Rep. Vol. VIII. p. 129), liberally reimbursed to him; and the remaining sum of £63 : 8, was raised by himself and his friends. Here, on Lord's day evenings, and at other times, he continued preaching the Gospel to the poor, until the end of his life. In addition, he defrayed the purchase of further land, and the expenses of repairing the Chapel, and bequeathed £200 for its future support. Nor has he been unmindful, in his *Will*, of the Episcopal and the Dissenting Congregations severally, and far more recently, formed in the immediate neighbourhood.

† I subjoin as correct a list as I can obtain, of the publications of the late Rev. James Scott: his occasional contributions to periodical publications, are not here noticed:—

of Secretary to the *Stourbridge Auxiliary Bible Society,** from the period when it was founded: this engaged much of his time and thoughts. It was an Institution, the object and the plan of which were dear to his heart: it admirably suited his catholic and benevolent spirit, and he was very active, judicious, and successful in advancing its interests. Here, again, who will be to his vicinity what he has been?

Who, let me add, will supply his place to those of his brethren that were most intimately connected with him in the ministry of the Gospel? Who, like *him*, will gladden, by his presence, their stated meetings, and teach them, by his engaging example, what they should do, and what they should avoid? But I must hasten to a conclusion. It is chiefly Time which can set limits to the review and the delineation of such a character. Let the rest be told by the grief which is too deep for utterance; by mourning kindred; by fraternal, warm, invariable affection; by the tears of a colleague endeared to his soul, who served with him as a son, and honoured him as a father; by the lamentations of bereaved congregations, who can feel the extent and the nature of their loss; by those of domestics cordially attached to one of the most generous and considerate of masters; by the sighs of numbers whom he relieved and blessed; by the sympathies echoed from our churches in other and remote provinces of the kingdom; nor

---

Supplement to Carpenter's Letter to Foley—1792.
Autumnal Reflections (a Sermon)—1797.
Address to the Members of a Christian Church, on the Lord's Supper—1806. *Fourth Edition*—1824.
Sermon on Intemperance—on Wakes—1807.
On the death of the Rev. Benjamin Carpenter, with the Address at the Interment—1816.
Sermon at Oldbury Lecture—1817.
Advice to the Afflicted—1819. *Second Edition*—1821.
Sermon at Lye Waste: a memorial of the Divine Goodness—1824.
Address on opening a Charity School at Cradley—1826.
Prayers and Directions for Children.
Resolutions and Reports of Stourbridge Auxiliary Bible Society—nearly from 1812 and 1813 to 1827, inclusively.

He edited the following Tracts:
Pious Cottager—1820.
Memoir of Mr. Thomas Bissett—Address to Parents—1823. *These Tracts were written by the late Rev. B. Carpenter.*

* The successive Reports of the Stourbridge Bible Society, were generally framed by Mr. James Scott, and, for the most part, contain a large portion of interesting and valuable information, in respect of the diffusion, &c. of the Holy Scriptures, and are not limited to local intelligence.

least, by the sensations which the sad tidings of his illness and death produced throughout the district where this incomparable man had so long resided, to which he was so pre-eminently a benefactor, and where, without distinction of party of any sort, he was universally admired, esteemed, and loved, for his character, and for his works' sake.*

J. K.

Sketch of the Controversy between the Rev. J. R. Beard, and the Rev. Robert Taylor.

Mr. B.—Before proceeding to controvert your chief positions, I deem it desirable my readers should ascertain the manner in which you conduct this controversy respecting the truth of Christianity.—(L. iii. p. 62.)

Mr. T.—We calmly and impartially examine the evidences of Christianity.

Mr. B.—A few extracts from your Oration, will show with what calmness and impartiality you conduct your discussions:—"The sincere milk of God's Word can only be sucked through the toothless gums of imbecility." "You will find no creature, bearing human face and front, so savage, so deceitful, so wicked, as a Christian." "We accuse them (Christians) of villany and crime." "This farce of religion, this masquerade of Christianity." "Every saint that ever breathed, hath been, or is, in understanding a fool, or in heart a villain."—But enough of such specimens of "calmness and impartiality;" and there are others too horrible and shocking to quote.—(L. iii. p. 62, 63.)

Mr. T.—"It will be hard to determine (says Archbishop Tillotson) how many degrees of innocence and good nature, or of coldness and indifference in religion, are necessary to overbalance the fury of blind zeal; since several zealots had been excellent men, if their religion had not hindered them, if the doctrines and principles of their church had not spoiled their natural disposition." A just compliment to the *moral* influence of divine *faith*. The perfect believer becomes a perfect fiend.

Mr. B.—Now notice, readers, the inference of Mr. Taylor. Faith, Christian faith, converts, according to the "compliment" of Tillotson, the perfect believer into the

---

* Taken, in substance, from the Funeral Sermon for Mr. Scott.

perfect fiend. But Tillotson is animadverting on the influence of *Catholicism*, in a sermon on the 5th of November; and these are his words:—"I do willingly acknowledge the great piety and charity of several persons who lived and died in *that communion* (the Catholic), as Erasmus, Father Paul, Thuanus, and many others, who had, in truth, more goodness in them, than the principles of *their* religion do either incline men to or allow of; and yet he that considers how universally almost all the *Papists* in Ireland were engaged in that massacre, which is still fresh in our memories, will find it very hard to determine how many degrees of innocency and good nature, or of coldness and indifference, are necessary to overbalance the fury of a blind zeal, *and a misguided conscience.* I doubt not but *Papists* are made like other men; nature hath not generally given them such savage and cruel dispositions, but their religion hath made them so. *Whereas, true Christianity is not only the best, but the best-natured institution in the world; and as far as any church is departed from good nature, and become cruel and barbarous, so far is it degenerated from Christianity.* I am loth to say it, yet I am confident it is true, that many *Papists* would have been excellent persons, if *their* religion had not hindered them; if the doctrines and principles of their Church had not perverted and spoiled their natural dispositions."

Was there ever a greater perversion? I speak, my readers, as unto wise men; judge ye. It will be necessary, therefore, in our further consideration of Mr. Taylor's statements, to use caution and wariness, lest his calmness and impartiality should lead us astray.—(L. iii. p. 63, 64.)

Mr. T.—The recorded facts of Christianity may be explained on the supposition of its being false. To establish this point, I refer to transubstantiation; and I ask, if thousands of persons would not swear, that they had eaten and drank the corporeal flesh and blood of the Deity?

Mr. B.—Granting the correctness of Mr. Taylor's statement, I cannot imagine, that, when pressed, he will contend that the cases are parallel. The persons to whom he refers, have been *educated* in the belief of the doctrine of transubstantiation, have cherished it as a tenet sanctioned by antiquity, reverenced by their fathers, conducive to their own best interests, associated with their dearest feelings in the past, and their brightest anticipations in

the future. Those who renounced Paganism, had first to render powerless all these interesting associations, then to receive some "new thing," not only subversive of former prejudices, but hostile to former practices also; with which their hearts had never beat in unison, and their understandings connected nothing in this life, but obloquy, desertion, and death.—(L. iii. p. 66.)

Mr. T.—But neither the primitive Christians, nor the whole human race, can evidence the existence of a miracle; because man is a fallible creature, and may be deceived; a perverse creature, and may be deceitful.

Mr. B.—And as Mr. Taylor is a man, he may possess these qualities, and negative his assertions by his own argument; the more so, when he sets himself in opposition to the whole human race.—(L. iii. p. 66.)

Mr. T.—I tell them, they lie, though they were millions. A miracle is an impossibility to God himself—is an argument of weakness, not of power.

Mr. B.—In other words, it is an argument of weakness, not of power, that a father corrects his child; that a machinist arrests the working of an engine; that a lawgiver deviates from his usual course of procedure. I had thought that ancient fate, which was fabled to bind the gods in its iron chains, indicated weakness, rather than power. But liberty, it seems—full and perfect liberty to do whatever is most fitting upon the whole, and for each particular juncture—liberty is an argument of *weakness!* Surely, he who established the laws of nature, can suspend the laws which he established: he that at first made man, and breathed into him the breath of life, has power to re-animate the insensible corse. Admit the creation of man, and you have admitted the exertion of miraculous agency. (L. iii. p. 66, 67.)

Mr. T.—But, first, there is no evidence to show that Christianity had its origin in Judea, in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar; and, secondly, there is evidence that it had not.

Mr. B.—The passage of Tacitus, then, requires our first attention. The words, *Nero subdidit reos*, you translate, "Nero subdued the accused." Who were the accused? Nero, of having set fire to the city of Rome. Nero, therefore, subdued himself.

Mr. T.—Nay, it was the Christians that he subdued.

Mr. B.—Were the Christians, then, in arms against Nero, that he was obliged to reduce them into submission?

Your learning ought to have informed you, that *subdidit* does not signify "subdued," but substituted, or accused falsely. And agreeably to this, the words are rendered by Dr. Lardner, "Nero procured others to be accused;" and by Murphy, "He determined to transfer the guilt to others." Either of these renderings restores the sense of the passage, which is lost in your Oration.—(L. iii. p. 68.)

Mr. T.—But even were this passage genuine, it does not pledge the separate testimony of its author to the origin of Christianity, but only to the accounts which Christians of the very worst characters gave of it.

Mr. B.—Indeed! Where in the world is it to be found? I should have been content, if the words "I conjecture," had been in the above sentence. Be it then known, that there exists not in favour of this conjecture, even the shadow of a proof. Strong presumptions against it, however, are most obvious. Do Christians call their religion a fatal or destructive superstition? Do high-minded historians, such as Tacitus, resort to the dregs of the populace (as were the Christians, according to Mr. Taylor) for the materials of their relations? Would Tacitus rely on the unsupported assertions of the "very worst of characters?" —(L. iii. p. 68, 69.)

Mr. T.—But the passage does not prove the resurrection of Christ.

Mr. B.—No: nobody ever said that it did *prove* that fact. Yet it affords no mean presumption of its truth; otherwise, how, without the certainty of this, or some other miraculous interposal to attest *the truth* of Christianity, would Tacitus have found, so soon after the death of Christ, "a very great multitude" of Christians at Rome? —(L. iii. p. 69.)

Mr. T.—The resurrection of Christ was not so much as pretended to in the time of Tacitus; and the Epistle of Clemens (A.D. 96) contains the strongest possible evidence of the fact.

Mr. B.—In making such a statement, Mr. Taylor must certainly have reckoned largely on the ignorance of his readers, for the following are the most positive testimonies from the Epistle of Clemens, against the correctness of his assertions:—"The Lord does continually show us that there shall be a future resurrection, of which he has made our Lord Jesus Christ the first fruits, *raising him from the dead;*" "By him (Jesus Christ) would God have us taste

the knowledge of *immortality;*" "Being thoroughly assured *by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" And if the resurrection of Christ was not so much as pretended to, &c. why should Celsus use these words?—"Let us consider whether any one that has really died, *ever rose again* in the same body."—(L. iii. p. 69.)

(To be Continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

Sir,

If you should deem the following account of my labours, drawn from the journal which I have kept during the fifteen months in which I have acted as the stated Missionary of the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society, worthy of a place in your highly valuable Miscellany, its insertion would oblige many of your readers.

The Association, under whose auspices I have acted during the above mentioned period, has regularly supplied four congregations with the means of moral and religious improvement. Its exertions have been principally, though by no means exclusively, confined within the very populous district around Manchester; and have, upon the whole, been attended with considerable success.

At Oldham, I have preached many times; but from various causes, the congregation there still continues in a very depressed state. The Society at Oldham, has been peculiarly unfortunate. It was early deprived of the very efficient services of that truly excellent young man, the late Rev. B. Goodier, under whose ministry, had Providence spared his life, it would in all probability have continued to flourish. Several of the principal members emigrated to America, and from the difficulty of getting a supply, the public services of the Chapel were very irregular, nor from the same cause has the congregation enjoyed the advantages it otherwise would have done, during the last quarter. But notwithstanding the low state of the Society at Oldham, I am glad to find, that the few friends of Unitarianism there, are manifesting a greater zeal, and indulge the hope that means will shortly be devised for regularly conducting public worship.

I have often preached in several populous villages in the vicinity of Oldham; and have sometimes addressed large audiences in the open air, and distributed a great number of tracts. The working people of this district have long been noted for their rough and uncouth manners, but they seem now to be emerging from the darkness in which they have been enveloped for ages; and manifest a spirit of inquiry on moral and religious subjects. I have reason to believe that I have been the means of widely scattering in this densely populated district, the seed of future good.

At Middleton I have preached frequently, but not with that success which I could wish. The congregation is composed of thinking and serious people, but their number is small. They have a Sunday School that is flourishing; in which 120 poor children are reaping the advantages of education. Though Unitarianism has not rapidly increased in Middleton, still much that is valuable has been effected; many popular prejudices have been softened down, and a more liberal spirit is beginning to manifest itself towards the Unitarians.

At Swinton, my labours, in conjunction with those of others, have been very successful. The regular congregation consists of about 80 persons. A Sunday School is likewise established, in which 150 children are instructed. I have often preached on a week-day evening, in the different houses of those who belong to the Society. I would strongly recommend this plan, wherever it is practicable; it carries religion to the homes of the people—brings it before their children, and thus promotes family religion and domestic happiness. The Society at Swinton, is greatly indebted to the attention and exertions of two gentlemen, who reside near the village (one of whom is a Missionary preacher, and was the founder of the Society), and who have given me every assistance and encouragement.

Astley I have frequently visited, and spent many agreeable days with this interesting people. The Society here is a living proof of the great good which is sometimes found to attend the smallest beginnings. A few years since, Unitarianism was quite unknown to the inhabitants of this village, but now there are not less than eighty or a hundred, and often a much great number, who meet regularly on the Sabbath, to "worship the Father in spirit and in truth." When the Missionary Society began its operations here, the religious services were conducted for a considerable time in a barn, as no better place could then be procured. The people flocked together for a while, to hear what this new doctrine was, but manifested no inclination to embrace Unitarianism; many, indeed, who are now its firmest friends, evinced the greatest opposition. I mention this, to show that the people of Astley were not forward in identifying themselves with Unitarians—their conversion was gradual, and therefore, I hope, the more certain. As soon as a few began to avow Unitarian sentiments, a more commodious place was taken—a room capable of accommodating near 200 people, in which a Sunday School was commenced, and public worship regularly conducted. The congregation, from that time, has continued to increase, and the Sunday School consists of 150 children. The Teachers meet together weekly on Saturday evenings, for the truly commendable object of mutual improvement. It must afford to the benevolent mind the highest degree of pleasure, to visit this little community, and to witness their proceedings: with them I have spent some of the happiest days of my life.

I have visited the district of the Methodist Unitarians three times, and have been pleased to observe the cause of truth advancing among them. My first visit to this part was in May 1827,

the second in January 1828, and from the third I am just returned. I have each time taken up my head quarters at Padiham, as I thought this Society stood most in need of my services. When I visited them last year, I found them active and zealous in the cause of religion, though they were but just recovering from the very severe distress under which they had painfully laboured. But on my last visit to them, I found their numbers greatly increased, and every prospect of further success. I preached on the Sunday, and sometimes during the week, to congregations consisting of 300 to 400 people, who paid the greatest attention. They have, likewise, weekly prayer meetings, which are held in different parts of the town. I have attended some of them, and was delighted to see the decent and truly Christian manner in which they were conducted. A Superintendent is appointed, who commences by reading and expounding a portion of Scripture; he afterwards, with as many others as feel desirous, reads a hymn, and engages in prayer. At the meetings which I attended, there could not be less than 100 persons, though another of the same kind was held in a different part of the town, and which I understood was equally numerous. I feel persuaded, from what I have seen here, and at other places, that meetings of this or a similar nature, are admirably calculated to excite the best emotions of the soul, to promote the growth of genuine piety, and to extend the bounds of Christian benevolence. They have likewise held, during the winter, weekly meetings, for the investigation of certain passages of Scripture, and which have been numerously attended. The Society at Padiham, affords one of the best proofs I ever had, of the peculiar adaptation of Unitarian Christianity to the wants and capacity of the poor. They not only understand its principles, but, likewise, enjoy its practical influences. Several of them have told me, that during their late distress—when under the privations of want—their religion afforded them the richest consolation. Often have I heard them speak, with feelings of the liveliest gratitude, of the donations sent them by their distant friends: they were cheerfully given, and most thankfully received. The congregation still continues to labour under a heavy ground-rent for the Chapel, £10 per annum, which, to a people that are extremely poor, is a great burden. They have hitherto received the kind assistance of friends, or they never could have raised, in addition to their other necessary expenses, annually, such a sum among themselves. Should an appeal be made to the public to assist them in removing this burden, which so materially operates against the cause of truth in Padiham, we most sincerely hope, that it may receive the attention of the charitable and benevolent. I feel great pleasure in stating, that the Sunday School, connected with this congregation, is in a most flourishing state, consisting of 240 scholars, several of whom are adults.

During my visits to Padiham, I have often preached in the week, and sometimes early on the Sunday morning, in several of the surrounding villages. I have generally had large audiences, and never received the slightest interruption. I have had the honour of preaching the great doctrine of the Divine Unity, where

it had never been preached before, at least, as it is maintained by Unitarians. On Sunday morning, April 27, I preached to between 200 and 300 people at Downham, a most beautiful village situated under the eastern part of Pendle Hill. The service was conducted in a garden, as the house was too small. In this retired village, eight miles from any Unitarian congregation, are living about a dozen intelligent and serious Unitarians, whom I recommended to meet together on the Lord's Day, for Christian worship.

At Rattonstall, I have preached twice to pretty good congregations. This Society, a few years since, with their worthy minister, who is upwards of seventy, were avowed Antinomians. But such is the change, that they are now decided Unitarians. At Newchurch, I have preached only once, but have had considerable intercourse with their highly respected minister, Mr. J. Ashworth. The congregation, I understand, amounts on the Sunday to about 300. Upon the whole, from what I have seen of the Unitarians in this part, I can bear testimony to their piety, zeal, and good sense; and am thoroughly convinced, that the labours of a Missionary, would, in this extensive and populous district, meet with an ample reward.

G. BUCKLAND.

MANCHESTER, May 9, 1828.

REVIEW.

"*Bible Controversy in Ireland. Infallibility not possible; [Mental] Error not culpable, &c.—Hunter, London.*"

(Continued from page 322.)

MR. MAGUIRE, on the part of the Catholics, admitted, that on many subjects connected with Religion, and on many texts of Scripture, Christians must be guided by their own rational interpretations. The author, after showing the various meanings which may be given of one passage, produced by Mr. Maguire in the discussion, thus sums up the argument:

"Countrymen, my position is, that, INFALLIBILITY being the result required, it is demonstrative, that if the grounds upon which you would erect it, be *in any degree* DUBIOUS, you attempt an impossibility;—infallibility *never can* be established upon such a basis; for this plain reason, that no conclusion can be stronger than the premises by which it is proved. If the definitions and axioms of the first book of Euclid's mathematics, were in the remotest degree uncertain, the truth of the first proposition in that book, which is founded upon them, must be in an equal degree uncertain, and it would be impossible to demonstrate that an equilateral triangle could be constructed upon a given finite right line. In a word, as Mr. Locke observes, 'in any truth, the ar-

guments that gain it assent, are the vouchers and GAGE of its probability to us; and we can receive it for no other than such as they deliver it to our understanding.' Wherefore, if it be only upon *probable* evidence that the text—'I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world,'—imports that I am supernaturally guarded from error, it can be *no more* than probable, and not by any means certain, that I actually *am* exempt from error. So that, were I convinced of the doctrine in question upon these grounds, my persuasion might be expressed in the following terms:—I am fallibly convinced that I am infallible! I have the most absolute assurance, that, in holding the doctrine of Transubstantiation, I *cannot* be wrong, and yet I confess I *may* be wrong!! It is *not* possible I can err, and yet it *is* possible!!! Which, if I am any judge of language, is identical with saying:—'It is possible for the same thing *to be* and *not to be* at one and the same time.' "

Mr. Maguire, with great simplicity, inquires, for the purpose of showing the uniform doctrine of the Church, and therefore its Infallibility, "Could Christ leave hundreds of millions of men for nine hundred years in error?" The author replies:

"Mr. Maguire appears to hold the doctrine of the Trinity in very high estimation: But I could produce many of the most eminent names in his Church, to prove, that, prior to the Council of Nice, in the year 325, upon this doctrine, the visible Church was abandoned to the deepest uncertainty and error. Whatever room for dispute there may be, respecting the opinions of the Fathers of the three first centuries, as to the particular dignity of the Son, or the precise degree of reverence and worship they may have assigned to him, it appears to be clear beyond all rational doubt, that the Nicene notions of his absolute co-equality with the Father, were utterly unknown in those periods. But even were it possible for this to be rebutted, which I am well persuaded it is not, I believe it has never been pretended that the personality, or divinity of the Spirit, was contemplated, even so late as the Council of Nice; which, in common with the Fathers of the preceding ages, must accordingly share in the imputation of error, with respect to a doctrine, without which, Mr. Maguire, not less than Mr. Pope, would seem to conclude there can be no such thing as Christianity.

"Not only, however, have we these intimations of the possibility of error in the ancient Church, but it so happened that, precisely at that period which is so habitually and exultingly referred to, as the era when infallibility presented itself with a formality and energy unexampled before—at that period, Roman Catholics! when the first of those General Councils, which were to establish so despotic a sway over the liberties and opinions of mankind for ages to come, announced its decrees,—then it was, such conflicting decisions came forth, and upon such balanced pretensions sustained; such venerable synods assembled, and such opposite conclusions

were proclaimed, as must render it a task incomparably less easy than your doctors suppose it to be, to determine to which side the supernatural authority devolved of closing for ever all human inquiry upon the subjects they discussed. Yes, my deluded countrymen! the three hundred Bishops of Nice are gravely held forth to you by the Maguires, and the Kinsellas, and the Clowrys, as speaking the voice of antiquity, and of the times in which they lived,—nay, as illuminated by the special suggestions of heaven; while the six hundred Bishops of Ariminum are never once named, who, but a few years after, condemned all that the Nicene Bishops had decreed, as having neither Scripture, nor Antiquity, nor the Divinity in their favour! I care not what, or how great, their differences were: it is enough that, *differ they did;* and that from these differences events resulted, from which, assuming the present opinions of Rome to be right, it is demonstrable that Christ did leave his Church, including its 'millions of men,' and that for ages together, under the influence of deep and disastrous error. And here I am led to remark upon a curious device of Mr. Maguire, who, in order to overthrow the testimony of St. Jerome as to the actual and literal diffusion of Arianism over the greater portion of the world, endeavours (at p. 221–2) to represent as a sort of *jocular* '*hyperbole*,' the celebrated saying of that saint, that 'the whole world was astonished to find itself Arian.' The truth is, my friends, notwithstanding the triumphant infallibility of Nice, the whole world *was* become Arian—Emperor, Pope, Bishops, and all."

In order to illustrate in another manner the claim of Infallibility, the author introduces the proceedings of the General Councils:

"Well did Gregory Nazianzen (a saint in your calender) know them, when on being summoned to the next general council, that of Constantinople, he replied, that 'he desired to avoid all councils, having never seen the slightest good effect from any of them —that they increased instead of lessening the evils they were designed to prevent—and that the man who went to them, would sooner contract dishonesty himself, than repress the dishonesty of others.' 'These conveyers of the Holy Ghost,' says he, 'these preachers of peace to all men, (raging like furious horses in battle, and like madmen casting dust into the air,) grow so bitterly outrageous and clamorous against one another in the midst of the Church, bandying into parties, mutually accusing each other, under the furious impulse of a lust of power and dominion, that they seem as if they would rend the whole world in pieces.' 'Never will I sit in synods of geese or cranes blindly fighting together; where we meet with contention and strife, and the vile behaviour concealed before, of barbarous men collected into one assembly.' And of the clergy in general of those times, he says, that they aimed at ecclesiastical preferments, 'not as a station wherein they ought to be a pattern of every virtue, but as a trade to get money; not as a ministry and stewardship of which an account must be given, but as a magistracy subject to no examination. Engaged

in everlasting disputes; wrangling, shuffling, and cavilling about baubles, under the specious pretext of defending the faith; abhorred by the Pagans, and despised by all honest Christians!'

"IRISHMEN!—CATHOLIC ENGLISHMEN!—were these the inspired depositaries of the faith which your spiritual guides, upon *their* authority, would bind upon your conscience? Will you believe that it was the voice of the Holy Ghost which spake by the lips of these men? Could those pretenders be of Christ, who were so flagrantly destitute of the spirit of Christ? And if they were not of Christ, could he have appointed *them* the infallible organs and interpreters, for all ages, of that faith which was to save the world?—Will the people of these islands, sagacious, free, noble, spirited in all things else, for ever be drivellers in religion only? But to our councils:—'Since the Nicene council,' says St. Hilary, 'we do nothing but write creeds; and while we anathematize one another, scarce any one is Christ's.—We decree annual and monthly creeds concerning God: we repent our decrees: we defend those that repent of them: we anathematize those that we defended: we defend other men's opinions in our own, or condemn our own in those of other men; and while we bite one another, we are consumed of one another!' These are strong words. It is a remarkable circumstance, that Pope Leo the First, sirnamed the Great, exasperated by its decrees against the more than nominal supremacy of Rome, accuses the fourth general council of Chalcedon, of 'ambition and inconsiderate temerity,' and draws, in consequence, the precise conclusion which I am endeavouring to impress upon you, with respect to them all, namely, that it was 'therefore *no fit habitation for the Holy Ghost.*' Memorable indeed, were the scenes to which this last of the first four general councils gave rise. Suffice it to say, that having been preceded by such tumults at both the councils of Ephesus, and having been itself interrupted by such scenes as would have disgraced the less barbarous rabble in their streets, its termination was not followed by any more edifying effects.—'The Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch cursed the council; and the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople cursed them for so doing; and Timothy, Bishop of Constantinople, first cursed those who did not receive the council, but being rebuked by the Emperor, he cursed every one that did receive it!'"

We would gladly quote more from this admirable work, but our difficulty, where all is so excellent, is that of selection. The passage in reply to Mr. Maguire's charge against Protestants of "foolery and fanaticism"—that powerful one on Transubstantiation—the exposure of Mr. Pope's abandonment of the Protestant principle in his defence of Protestantism—the reasoning on the innocency of mental error—and the remarks on Mr. Pope's assumption, that the doctrine of the Trinity is one which cannot but be believed by every genuine Christian, these portions especially we would gladly see circulated far and wide.

The whole work is indeed worthy the serious and attentive perusal of every friend of liberty, righteousness, and truth. We fear, however, that the price of the volume will be an obstacle to its circulation among the mass of the people. Is not this an additional call upon the friends of Scriptural Inquiry in Ireland, to unite in forming a fund to aid the progress of knowledge?

The following Note we must extract:

"I have great satisfaction in referring to Mr. Foster's Essay, I believe that, together with an article in the *Westminster Review* for July 1826, supplying some supplementary and very original matter, it has for ever set at rest the question of the responsibility of error. Subsequently to the appearance of the first edition of the Essay (in 1821), there was indeed an attempt made, by Dr. Wardlaw, of Glasgow, to subvert the conclusions it had established, in a reply (so the Doctor imagined it to be) to the Inaugural Discourse of Mr. Brougham, as Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow. It is remarkable, that this supposed attack was, in fact, a decided confirmation of the views of Mr. Brougham, and the writer of the Essay. In no one leading proposition do they even remotely differ. Dr. Wardlaw, intending to attack Mr. Brougham, falls foul of *the very parties* whom Mr. Brougham himself would have equally condemned with the Doctor. I say nothing of his applications of Scripture to the argument. They are such as we would expect from Dr. Wardlaw; *except*, perhaps, that in his enumeration of the *credenda* of the Gospel, at p. 67, of his tract, he has *omitted*—will the reader believe it—*the doctrine of the Trinity!* How is this? Are the anathemas, then, of Mr. Pope, to fall upon the head of that infallible dispenser of judgments, who had himself despatched so many others to 'weeping and gnashing of teeth,' for not coming up to *his* —doxy? Or was it from an impression, that a disbelief in the doctrine of the Trinity was not so *very* penal as Mr. Pope would have it to be? In either way, another instance, if any were wanting, that infallibility is about as invariable in the Protestant as in the Catholic world!"

There is one circumstance we cannot forbear noticing. Our pleasure in perusing the masterly publication we have been reviewing, has been often marred by the recollection that its author's name was not on the title-page. The title of one of William Penn's works, was, if we mistake not, "Innocency with her open face." It was quaint perhaps, but not the less good on that account.

Let it be remembered, too, that the claims of the Church of England and her Clergy, cannot be valid, if those of the Church of Rome are overthrown. The Mass Book and Common Prayer betray a common origin. Athanasius is a saint in both the churches. Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation differ but in a syllable. If,

therefore, a Clergyman of the English Communion be the author of the work before us, we yet hope to see him give a practical exemplification of the power of truth, by imitating Lindsey, and Jebb, and Wakefield. Let him no longer take the emoluments of a Church which his understanding despises and his heart disowns. Let him not turn the edge of his own weapons against the holy cause which he wishes to advocate. Let not a Doyle be able to point to him, as a proof of the inefficacy of Protestant principles; or a Maguire exult over his apostacy from a righteous practice. Let him "walk worthy of his honourable vocation," for "he who walketh uprightly walketh surely."

We have felt it to be our duty to make these remarks. Reverence for truth and righteousness has called them forth. The intellectual endowments of the author excite our admiration. We should grieve if his conduct merited not correspondent eulogy. Conscience and interest may clash, but conscience is to be preferred before all things.

We conclude our notice of the work, in the language of its author:—

"Nature will not be outraged with impunity; the laws of evidence will not be trifled with, nor the human mind be made the sport of words without meaning, and arguments without sense, with any hope of eventual success in the attempt. Credulity may do something, indolence may do much, and party be more powerful than all, in retaining mankind in the shackles of whatever superstition may have first got possession of the mind; but discussion must invigorate the public intellect; and a sagacious people will not always resign themselves to guides, who, under a pretence of conducting them to salvation, would shock the first principles of reason; and raising themselves to the rank of Gods, would render their votaries less than man!—People of Ireland! Parliaments may wrong—and rulers be unkind to you; but happen what may, fail not to *reverence yourselves.*"

"Observations on the True Canon & Creed of Christianity."
Nisbet, London; Robertson, Edinburgh; Collins, Glasgow.

THE object of this well written little work, is to show, that "1. A belief of the Old Testament was not required of the first Christians, as a condition of communion. 2. The four Gospels were collected into a volume by themselves, and frequently quoted and referred to, as separate from the Epistles of the Apostles. 3. The contents of the Gospels were known from the beginning, and previous to being committed to writing. 4. The first Christians had a particular veneration for the Gospels. 5. At the same time, doubts were entertained about the authenticity and

authority of several of the Epistles for a long period; and ignorance, in general, prevailed of the whole, for a considerable time. For such reasons, (over and above their internal evidence,) we ought to look for and find *all the first principles and peculiar doctrines of Christianity*, in the Gospels alone."

It is conceived by its author, that if these principles could be established, a union of all Christians might be effected. The object is good, but its accomplishment difficult. This, however, should not deter from exertions for its accomplishment. We agree with the author, that the Gospels are the sacred storehouse of Christian truth, and that all doctrines should be tested by their teachings. But we regard the Epistles, Paul's especially, as most powerful testimonies to the divine origin of Christianity.

We are sorry that the Author or Editor, for there seems some confusion here, should have encumbered his subject with some useless machinery, as introductory to his remarks. It being an anonymous publication, is also objectionable. And we do greatly marvel, how any individual who has arrived at the views disclosed in these pages, can still hold himself forth as "a member of the National Church, and disposed to remain such, if he is not molested for his opinions." The Gospels, we think, should have taught him a different lesson. We protest, too, against the conclusion, that "the established forms of religion, in Scotland and in England, are, upon the whole, best suited to the habits and to the feelings of the respective countries." Are those habits Christian? Are those feelings correct? These are the questions. We think not: and though we wish well to the practical purpose of the author of the work—the formation into one body of all who name the name of Jesus—we are of opinion, that this cannot be effected, till Church Establishments are no more, and all Christians enjoy the liberty, as well as possess the spirit of the Saviour.

"*The Country Minister, a Poem, by the Rev. J. Brettell. Second Edition; Whittaker, London.*"

We have long intended to notice this interesting publication. We warmly recommend it to our readers. It is evidently the production of an enlightened mind, and feeling heart. There is a sweet and soothing melancholy breathing through many of its lines; others again are ad-

mirably descriptive, and several passages, which, if we had space to extract, would evince their author's power to "discourse most eloquent music." We look forward with pleasure, to the "Poetical Sketches from the Historical Books of the Old Testament," which, we hope, the author, from an encouraging list of subscribers, may soon be induced to publish.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

Glasgow, *June* 2, 1828.

Died, at Portsmouth, on Thursday, April 24, Sophia, wife of the Rev. Russell Scott, and daughter of the late Dr. Hawes, one of the founders of the Humane Society; after a lingering illness of several months, borne with the equanimity and fortitude which a spirit imbued with the love of God through Christ, can inspire. She was interred in the burial-ground attached to the Unitarian Chapel, High-Street, Portsmouth, of which her venerable husband has been the pastor, during the greater part of his active and useful life. On Sunday, May 4, the Rev. M. Maurice improved this afflictive dispensation in an excellent and appropriate discourse, delivered to an audience unusually large, many of whom had assembled to pay a tribute of respect to the memory of the departed lady, whom they greatly loved and respected. In his sermon, Mr. Maurice did not advert to the character of the deceased, owing to an injunction of silence which had been laid upon him. We highly appreciate the delicacy that dictated this injunction; yet the interests of virtue require us to declare, that we know no family, the members of which are more attached to each other, and in whose hearts, and upon whose lips, the law of kindness more abundantly dwells, than that over which Mrs. Scott had presided, and into which she had infused her own spirit. Her love for those of her own household did not cause her to forget the poor, the humble, and the distressed; on the contrary, loving her own, and loving them to the end, she learned to imbibe the spirit of her Saviour towards others. Ready to communicate of her abundance, and apt to teach the way of kindness and rectitude, with a heart formed for friendship with her equals, and guided in all its impulses by the teachings and hopes which religion suggests, she was endeared to all who knew her, whether poor or rich; and in her society, or her visits of mercy, they found the elements of happiness and comfort. Her bereaved and revered partner will know where, in his affliction, a solace may be found, and be led by the promptings of a heart imbued and habitually guided by the influence of Christianity, to the mercy-seat of that Father who, by his Son, has graciously said, "Ask, and it shall be given."

Died at Manchester, April 8, in the 34th year of her age, shortly after she had been delivered of twins, one of whom survives her, Mary Ann, wife of Mr. J. Armstrong, late of Taunton.

Mrs. A. was a native of Hinckley, in Leicestershire, and was very early in life deserted by her father, who left his family and settled in America. She was brought up, however, by an Aunt, in a manner the most judicious, as regarded the cultivation of her mind, the government of her temper, and the management of domestic affairs. Above all, care was taken to instil into her youthful mind those principles of rectitude and rational piety which shone conspicuous in after life. Gifted with a superior mind and a discriminating judgment, which were adorned with an amiable temper and agreeable manners, her society was always acceptable to her intimate friends and acquaintance; but she sought not pleasures *abroad*, she was happy, and succeeded in diffusing happiness *at home*. In industry, economy, and the management of household affairs, she was an example worthy of imitation. Her ambition, if ambition she had any, was to fulfil to the best of her powers all the duties of conjugal and maternal affection. To the instruction and comfort of her children, she was most particularly devoted; for them "she rose *early*, *late* took rest, and ate the bread of carefulness." May they long continue the living monuments of her unwearied care and kindness.

She was interred in the burial-ground attached to the Greengate Chapel, Salford. On the Sunday following, the Rev. J. R. Beard, whose ministerial services and friendship were always a source of great pleasure to her, delivered an appropriate and consoling sermon, from Isaiah xlix. 14, 15.

The Rev. G. Buckland, who has, for the last fifteen months, acted as stated Missionary to the Lancashire and Cheshire Unitarian Missionary Society, has accepted the unanimous invitation of the congregation at Dob-Lane, near Manchester, to become their Minister. It is his intention, however, to retain both the office and character of a Missionary, and to labour both on the Lord's day and during the week, in connection with the above named Association.

The Rev. W. Gaskell of Manchester College, York, has accepted the invitation to become Co-pastor with the Rev. J. G. Robberds, of the congregation assembling in Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester.

The North Eastern Association will hold its Anniversary meeting at Lutton, in Lincolnshire, on the 11th and 12th June. The Revds. W. P. Scargill, of Bury, and George Harris, of Glasgow, are expected to preach on the occasion.

The Annual Meeting of the Kent and Sussex Unitarian Association will be held at Tenterden, on the 25th June. Mr. Harris, of Glasgow, is invited to preach.

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 23. JULY, 1828. Vol. II.

Sketch of the Controversy between the Rev. J. R. Beard, and the Rev. Robert Taylor.

(Continued from page 349.)

Mr. T.—Tertullian, in his apology for the Christian faith, was anxious to enumerate all the facts that might recognise the origin of Christianity.

Mr. B.—It was not the object of the Christian apologists, so much to defend their religion, as to deprecate persecution. With this view, it is, that Tertullian says, in his Apology, cap. v. "Consult your histories, where you will find that Nero was the first to draw the bloody and imperial sword against this sect, then rising in Rome." What histories were there but those which we now have? Now, none of these could teach the fact, that Christians were then rising at Rome, except it is the history of Tacitus. From him, and from the very part that Mr. Taylor boldly rejects, we learn the circumstance alluded to by Tertullian.—(L. iii. p. 72, 73.)

Mr. T.—The passage of Tacitus is spurious, the words, *auctor nominis ejus Christus, &c.* bearing evidently the character of a marginal note.

Mr. B.—And yet it is strange, if this be the case, that the discovery has been reserved for Mr. Taylor. Not a vestige of suspicion does there exist of the spuriousness of the passage, from any critic of acknowledged talent. Unbelievers and Christians, with all their perspicuity and ingenuousness, have never descried or hinted the least probability of an interpolation, although thousands of critical eyes, and some with an express view to detect errors, have pored over the passage almost to blindness. Let it be observed, however, that our author does not attempt to deprive us of all the celebrated passage of Tacitus. He allows the former and latter part to be genuine, and restricts the interpolation within moderate limits. It begins, we are informed, with the words, *Auctor nominis ejus Christus*, "The author of this name, Christ," and terminates at *celebramtur que*, "and became

famous." Mr. Taylor still permits us to remain in undisturbed possession of the existence of Christians, Mr. Carlile, in the reign of Nero (A. D. 68). Returning our best thanks to Mr. Taylor, for that he did not conjecture away the whole, I shall endeavour to show the abortiveness of the attempt that has been made. *First*, then, I deny that the passage evidently bears the character of a marginal note; I deny that it might, with advantage to the construction, be thrown out again. And why have we not one line explaining how the passage mars the construction? Here, then, I might rest; my negative is as good as Mr. Taylor's affirmative. *Secondly*, Tacitus, in the preceding sentence, has mentioned the Christians (*Christianos*). How natural to *describe* the persons he had just mentioned, persons comparatively unknown to the readers of history—how natural to state, from whom and where they had derived their origin. *Thirdly*, one reason given by Mr. Taylor for rejecting the passage in Josephus, is, "the language is quite Christian." If, then, the language in Tacitus is quite *anti*-Christian, an *opposite* inference is to be drawn. And the language is quite anti-Christian, for it speaks of Christianity as an evil—a destructive superstition, and associates it with every thing atrocious and shameful. *Fourthly*, there is no propriety in the word, *igitur*, therefore, which commences the sentence immediately after the important passage, if that passage be rejected from the text. "Therefore, to suppress the rumour, Nero procured others to be accused, and inflicted exquisite punishment upon those people who were held in abhorrence for their crimes, and were commonly known by the name of Christians. Therefore, they were at first apprehended who confessed, &c." No good and elegant writer would use two therefores at the beginning of two consecutive sentences. It is true, the two therefores in Tacitus are not, as in English, identical words. The one is *ergo*, the other *igitur*, both meaning therefore. But I do not think that two consecutive sentences can be adduced from the writings of Tacitus, the first commencing with *ergo*, therefore, and the second commencing with *igitur*, therefore. And I may undertake to affirm, that no two such sentences can be shown, which bear the same relation to each other as those in question: and this is the point which it is essential for Mr. Taylor to establish. The passage would *suffer* by the rejection of the inter-

vening words. *Fifthly*, the style of the passage is the style of Tacitus, and therefore it is genuine. It possesses all his characteristic brevity and comprehension.—(L. iii. p. 69–72.)

Mr. T.—But the Christian Fathers have not stumbled upon this passage.

Mr. B.—How know you that, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. T.—They have not mentioned it.

Mr. B.—Oh! that is quite another matter. A man may stumble upon a passage without quoting it, I presume. And if they have not quoted, how many myriads of passages beside have they not quoted, yet who doubts *their* genuineness?

Mr. T.—But this was to their purpose.

Mr. B.—That I deny. There was no dispute in ancient times respecting the origin of Christianity. The Jews, Celsus and Prophyry, Hierocles and Julian, all concurred to overthrow Christianity, never denied its origination in Judea, and, according to Tacitus, under the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate. Nay, Celsus refers its rise to Judea, and speaks of Jesus as the man of Nazareth, who had existed not long before his time (A. D. 138).—(L. iii. p. 72.)

Mr. T.—The world had never heard of this famous passage till the 16th century, all the Codices Manuscripti of the annals and histories of Tacitus, being derived from the single copy which was written in the seventh or eighth century, according to Oberlid, and in the tenth or eleventh according to Ernesti, and which was brought out of a Westphalian monastery, and presented to Pope Leo the Tenth, whose learning enabled him well to imitate the style of Tacitus, as his station and opportunities enabled him to have been himself the author of the passage. Religious or conscientious scruples would never have stood in the way of this Father in God, who told his clergy, that "the fable of Jesus Christ brought grist to their mill, and it was but fair play to keep up that that kept up them."

Mr. B.—I shall begin with the latter part of the sentence, by exculpating the character of Leo the Tenth. Mr. Roscoe, in his life of Leo, has shown that his character was exemplary; and that the story respecting him has no authority but the uncorroborated assertion of a satirist, an enemy, and one who was at open war against the Pope, and who professed it to be his intention to give the Church

of Rome *double* according to her works. What wretches the world would take Christians to be, if they judged of them solely by the misrepresentations of Mr. Taylor's Oration!

But whether the Pope was so depraved or not, as to wish to falsify history, he had neither the talent nor opportunity, in this case, to secure success; and you are sadly misinformed, when you tell us, that the world never heard of this passage till the sixteenth century. It was not the last six, but the first five books of the Annals of Tacitus, that were discovered in Westphalia in the sixteenth century. And it is in the last six, that the important passage occurs; and these had been several times reprinted before the sixteenth century, long before Leo was born. For your confutation, I refer you to Roscoe, and to Brotier's edition of Tacitus. Ernesti's Tacitus, also, which you appear to use, tells us the same tale. And Gibbon remarks, that the consent of all the ancient MSS. proves the genuineness of the disputed passage. The following is the passage of Gibbon entire:—"The most sceptical criticism is obliged to respect the *truth* of this extraordinary fact," (the persecution of Christians under Nero, 68, A. D.) "and the *integrity* of this celebrated passage of Tacitus. The former" (its truth) "is confirmed by the diligent and accurate Suetonius, who mentions the punishment inflicted upon the Christians. The latter" (its integrity and genuineness) "may be proved by the consent of the most ancient MSS.; by the inimitable style of Tacitus; by his reputation, which guarded his text from the interpolations of pious fraud; and by the purport of his narration."—*Decline and Fall*, vol. ii. p. 407.—(L. iii. p. 73–76.)

Mr. T.—This is an ironical concession, from the palpable weakness of the argument.

Mr. B.—No, Mr. Taylor, Gibbon had too much skill to allow his irony to remain undiscovered for years, as this has done, if it be irony. The witticism is worthless that requires a commentary, and the irony that is not obvious, had better never have been penned. The irony of Gibbon is fine, but it is perceptible on all occasions; otherwise it would fail of its designed effect. If, however, he had questioned the integrity of the passage, what should prevent him from speaking out? Would he have rendered himself obnoxious to the charge of drivelling, if he could have dispatched this difficulty at once, by exposing the

spuriousness of the passage? But we have still better evidence yet, of his real opinion. He has a note on the very passage you choose to suspect, and, assuming the truth of this passage, he corrects an error of the Jews. "This testimony, alone," he remarks, "is sufficient to expose the anachronism of the Jews, who place the birth of Christ near a century sooner." He here argues on the genuineness of the passage, and, of course, believed that it was genuine. Of irony, therefore, he thought not. In reference, moreover, to the matter in debate, we have a confliction of authorities. Mr. Taylor informs us, that the "difficulty" is an interpolation. "No," says Mr. Carlile, "Tacitus wrote the passage in question, and wrote from the accounts of Christians." We cannot receive both, and in our vacillation between adverse authorities, no one can be surprised if we abide by the old fashioned interpolation, and receive neither.

Whilst Mr. Taylor was occupied in conjecturing, he might as well have conjectured away the testimony of Pliny also. How easy were it to insert this letter in his collection. Conscientious scruples could have afforded no impediment.—(L. iii. p. 76–79.)

(To be Continued.)

Matthew the Evangelist, a Unitarian.

(Concluded from page 330.)

I QUOTE but one more text of this class: Chap. xxiv. 36. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels of heaven [in Mark, it is added, 'neither the Son'], but my Father only." In these words, our Saviour plainly and distinctly replies to an earnest and anxious question of his disciples, (verse 3, asking, "when these things shall be,") that "he does not know." The reference of our Lord is to the destruction of Jerusalem. When that was to happen, he says in so many words, he does not know, nor any other being beside the Father Omniscient. By this declaration, he disclaims all participation of the Divine nature and mind. He declares, that his knowledge is partial and limited. It is a denial, from his own mouth, of his Supreme Deity, or his equality with God.

I will waste but few words on the mode of reasoning, or trick, I should rather say, by which the true sense of

this text and similar ones, is evaded. "Our Saviour did *not know the day, as man*, though as *God* he did!" This is the Trinitarian argument. It is enough to reply to this, that it involves the blessed Saviour in the grossest prevarication, and therefore it cannot be maintained. The moral character of Jesus is sacrificed. For, the infinite, divine mind in Jesus, must have *embraced* and *included* the human; so that the human nature could not, by any possibility, know or be ignorant of any thing, but what the Divine nature must have participated in it. Therefore, for the *Son* (including both natures) to say, that he was ignorant of the day of Jerusalem's fall, or of any thing else, indeed, was a plain falsehood.

But our objection to this mode of reasoning on the part of Trinitarians, rests upon a broader ground than this. *We say, that it entirely sets aside the authority of Jesus, and provides a way of escape from all that he uttered, whether relating to doctrine or morals.* For if the devout and sincere Trinitarian is at liberty to explain away and reject the explicit statements of his Master, which do not harmonize with an adopted theory, on the ground that he spake them as a man, and therefore are not binding; the indevout man of the world may resist and shake off the morality of the Gospel, and the great sanction of future punishment, on the ground that, in his opinion, it was all uttered as man, and therefore is without authority. And we are all at liberty to select such doctrines and such moral precepts as are agreeable to us, and say of the rest, "Oh, it was spoken as *man*, and we have nothing to do with it!"

For myself, therefore, I shall always hold that, as unanswered and unanswerable, the force of which can only be evaded by a resort to that wretched subterfuge, that unauthorised and unscriptural dogma, the double nature of Christ; fatal alike to the moral character of the Saviour, and to the whole authority of his religion.

Before concluding, I will refer to a few passages which are wholly inexplicable on the Trinitarian hypothesis, except on the ground of the two natures of Christ, which is to be considered in the light of a mere evasion of the difficulty, and only to encounter far more formidable ones.

I name first the account given by the Evangelist, of the temptation of Christ. This, I maintain, is intelligible only on the supposition that Jesus was actually what he ap-

peared to be. It opens thus: "Then was Jesus led up by the Spirit into the wilderness, to be tempted of the Devil." "That is," says the Trinitarian, "then was Jesus, *i. e.* God the Son, led up by the Spirit, *i. e.* God the Holy Ghost, to be tempted—of the Devil." What inextricable confusion, what impossibilities are here! Can God be tempted, and by the Prince of Evil? And yet all this can be avoided only by that dangerous resort, which overthrows Christianity itself—the double nature of Christ.

Again, we read in the 26th chapter of this Gospel, of the agony in the garden, during which our Saviour utters this prayer: "O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." Was the being who put up this petition in so much agony, the Almighty God? And to whom, then, was the prayer preferred? And how could it be necessary? Was God subject to weakness and want, to infirmity and fear? And if so, what higher power was there to succour?

Again, "And about the ninth hour, Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And when he had cried again with a loud voice, he yielded up the ghost.

The questions which arise on this verse, but which I will not state, for they are truly shocking, can be answered only by the aid of the two-fold nature of Christ, and must be always regarded, therefore, as unanswered.

Although the testimony from this Gospel, both direct and indirect, in behalf of the Unity of God, and the derived power of Jesus Christ, is far from exhausted, yet I feel warned to bring these remarks to a close.

In the statements which have been made, many may think that I have been too minute, and have dwelt too long and earnestly on points already sufficiently obvious and plain. This may be so. I hope every one who calls himself a Unitarian, has often revolved the arguments which have now been offered, in his mind, and has long felt their force. But we do not make these statements over and over again, so much in the hope of pouring new knowledge into the minds of those who have diligently studied the principles of their faith, and feel, and know the adamantine foundation on which they rest, as with a view of catching the eye of some who may not as yet have given their thoughts to the subject, but who may

be willing to attend to it with dispassionate and honest minds; and with more especial reference, also, to those who nominally embrace our views, but who are but slightly acquainted with the grounds and reasons of them. For it cannot be denied, that there are not a few of those who think themselves and call themselves Unitarians, who are wofully ignorant of the worth and strength of that faith which they profess, and for whom, if they could be persuaded to read and study, scarce any statements or discussions could be too plain and elementary. These have been considered in what has been said, and will, in all our future labours, be held distinctly in sight. For these, there should be line upon line, precept upon precept; for if unenlightened, they will be too apt, in times of tribulation, to fall away, and apostatise. It is ignorance, ignorance alone, which Unitarianism has to fear. The intelligent Unitarian cannot fall away. It is incredible, that he who has ever thoroughly and devoutly studied the evidences of Unitarian Christianity, should afterward doubt their validity. Such an one has the same clear and confident perception of their unassailable strength, that the well grounded Christian has of the evidences of Christianity. We hold it to be an intellectual impossibility, for the well informed Christian to doubt the conclusiveness of that testimony that has made him such—to be converted to infidelity by a Paine or a Carlile. But nothing less impossible do we deem it, that a Unitarian Christian, supposing him possessed of ordinary strength of mind, to have conscientiously studied the subject, and adopted his views, on reflection and conviction, should be converted from his Unitarianism back to Orthodoxy. We might as well believe that a scholar would suddenly renounce any of the great principles in science or philosophy, which by universal consent have become a part of demonstrated truth; that in Chemistry, he would become a convert to the exploded doctrine of Phlogiston; that in Philosophy, he would cast away the system of Newton, and return to the whirlpools of Des Cartes; would forswear Bacon and Locke, and retreat to the logic of the Schools. But these things cannot be supposed of a *sound* mind, neither can the other.

Let, therefore, the leading points of the Unitarian belief be frequently stated, and the arguments which establish them be frequently presented in various forms, and

in different aspects, and in new relations, that if it be possible, minds of every character may find something suited to their peculiar wants and habits of thinking. If Unitarians will only *read*, and look into the evidences of their faith, they will never waver. Let them once be Unitarians from conviction and reflection, and it will be impossible that they should ever be any thing else. If, unhappily, they have trusted to the prejudices of education for safety, or to a second-hand faith, they may not be able to stand in the evil hour, nor should their fall surprise themselves or others. The essence of Unitarianism is self-inquiry, self-conviction. Then, it is quietness and assurance for ever.

It is hoped that the examination that has now been made of the evidence of Matthew, touching the doctrines of the Trinity, and the Unity of God, may be of service in strengthening the faith of some of those who are still inquiring for the right way. To the Unitarian who would desire to add fresh strength to his faith, it is recommended, as the most effectual method of confirming him in all good doctrine, to read over any one, or all of the Gospels, with a particular view to the evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity: let him mark the passages—without referring to commentators—which appear to *him* distinctly to teach or imply that doctrine—and I am willing to predict, that he will never again be tempted to doubt, if he had ever done so before, the solidity of that foundation on which his faith rests. Let the Trinitarian, who has made up his mind to be honest and fair, and unprejudiced in the work, go through a similar process, and I have not the least doubt that he would cast away his old belief as a baseless unsubstantial dream. For he would say, "whence should I derive my faith, if not from the discourses of Jesus himself, and from the professed historians of his life and doctrine; but from these sources I can gather no evidence that bears any proper proportion to the importance of the doctrine to be proved: the doctrine must have had its origin elsewhere."

My conclusion from the whole of what has gone before, is, if Matthew has failed to record the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Supreme Deity of Jesus Christ, he did not believe them—did not know of them, as doctrines of the Christian religion; and therefore they are *not* doctrines of Christianity. He *has* wholly failed to record them.

He has not *directly taught* them, and the whole tenor and prevailing language of his Gospel rejects them as false. In connection with this, let it be remembered, that Matthew's is to be regarded as a distinct and independent account of Christianity, containing what he must have deemed a complete representation of it; and the conclusion is irresistible, that he never heard of the dogmas in question, and never intended to teach them.

"*Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, occasioned by the publication of Scott's Life of Napoleon.*"

(Concluded from page 334.)

THERE have been two circumstances, which have done much to disarm or weaken the strong moral reprobation with which Bonaparte ought to have been regarded, and which we deem worthy of notice. We refer to the wrongs which he is supposed to have suffered at St. Helena, and to the unworthy use which the Allied Powers have made of their triumph over Napoleon. First, his supposed wrongs at St. Helena have excited a sympathy in his behalf, which has thrown a veil over his crimes. We are not disposed to deny, that an unwarrantable, because unnecessary, severity was exercised towards Bonaparte. We think it not very creditable to the British government, that it tortured a sensitive captive by refusing him a title which he had long worn. We think that not only religion and humanity, but self-respect forbids us to inflict a single useless pang on a fallen foe. But we should be weak indeed, if the moral judgments and feelings, with which Napoleon's career ought to be reviewed, should give place to sympathy with the sufferings by which it was closed. With regard to the scruples, which not a few have expressed, as to the right of banishing him to St. Helena, we can only say, that our consciences are not yet refined to such exquisite delicacy, as to be at all sensitive on this particular. We admire nothing more in Bonaparte, than the effrontery with which he claimed protection from the laws of nations. That a man, who had set these laws at open defiance, should fly to them for shelter; that the oppressor of the world should claim its sympathy as an oppressed man, and that his claim should find advocates; these things are to be set down among the extraordinary events of this extraordinary age. Truly, the human race is in a pitiable state. It may be trampled on, spoiled, loaded like a beast of burden, made the prey of rapacity, insolence, and the sword; but it must not touch a hair, or disturb the pillow of one of its oppressors, unless it can find chapter and verse in the code of national law, to authorise its rudeness towards the privileged offender! For ourselves, we should rejoice to see every tyrant, whether a usurper or hereditary prince, fastened to a lonely rock in the ocean. Whoever gives clear, undoubted

proof, that he is prepared and sternly resolved to make the earth a slaughter-house, and to crush every will adverse to his own, ought to be caged like a wild beast; and to require mankind to proceed against him according to written laws and precedents, as if he were a private citizen in a quiet court of justice, is just as rational as to require a man, in imminent peril from an assasin, to wait and prosecute his murderer according to the most protracted forms of law. There are great solemn rights of nature, which precede laws, and on which law is founded. There are great exigences in human affairs, which speak for themselves, and need no precedent to teach the right path. There are awful periods in the history of our race, which do not belong to its ordinary state, and which are not to be governed and judged by ordinary rules. Such a period was that, when Bonaparte, by infraction of solemn engagements, had thrown himself into France, and convulsed all Europe; and they, who confound this with the ordinary events of history, and see in Bonaparte but an ordinary foe to the peace and independence of nations, have certainly very different intellects from our own.

We confess, too, that we are not only unable to see the wrong done to Napoleon in sending him to St. Helena, but that we cannot muster up much sympathy for the inconveniences and privations which he endured there. Our sympathies in this particular are wayward and untractable. When we would carry them to that solitary island, and fasten them on the illustrious victim of British cruelty, they will not tarry there, but take their flight across the Mediterranean to Jaffa, and across the Atlantic to the platform where the Duke d'Enghien was shot, to the prison of Toussant, and to fields of battle where thousands at his bidding lay weltering in blood. When we strive to fix our thoughts upon the sufferings of the injured hero, other and more terrible sufferings, of which he was the cause, rush upon us; and his complaints, however loud and angry, are drowned by groans, and execrations which fill our ears from every region which he traversed. We have no tears to spare for fallen greatness, when that greatness was founded in crime, and reared by force and perfidy. We reserve them for those on whose ruin it rose. We keep our sympathies for our race, for human nature in its humbler forms, for the impoverished peasant, the widowed mother, the violated virgin; and are even perverse enough to rejoice, that the ocean has a prison-house, where the author of those miseries may be safely lodged. Bonaparte's history is to us too solemn, the wrongs for which humanity and freedom arraign him, are too flagrant, to allow us to play the part of sentimentalists around his grave at St. Helena. We leave this to the more refined age in which we live; and we do so, in the hope that an age is coming of less tender mould, but of loftier, sterner feeling, and of deeper sympathy with the whole human race. Should our humble page then live, we trust with an undoubting faith, that the uncompromising indignation with which we plead the cause of our oppressed and insulted nature, will not be set down to the account of our vindictiveness and hardness of heart.

We observed that the moral indignation of many towards Bonaparte, had been impaired or turned away, not only by his supposed wrongs, but by the unworthy use which his conquerors made of their triumph. We are told, that bad as was his despotism, the Holy Alliance is a worse one; and that Napoleon was less a scourge, than the present coalition of the continental monarchs, framed for the systematic suppression of freedom. By such reasoning, his crimes are cloaked, and his fall made a theme of lamentation. It is not one of the smallest errors and sins of the Allied Sovereigns, that they have contrived, by their base policy, to turn the resentments and moral displeasure of men from the usurper upon themselves. For these sovereigns we have no defence to offer. We yield to none in detestation of the Holy Alliance, profanely so called. To us its doctrines are as false and pestilent, as any broached by Jacobinism. The Allied Monarchs are adding to the other wrongs of despots, that of flagrant ingratitude—of ingratitude to the generous and brave nations, to whom they owe their thrones, whose spirit of independence and patriotism, and whose hatred of the oppressor, contributed more than standing armies, to raise up the fallen, and to strengthen the falling monarchies of Europe. Be it never forgotten in the records of despotism—let history record it on her most durable tablet—that the first use made by the principal continental sovereigns, of their regained or confirmed power, was, to conspire against the hopes and rights of the nations by whom they had been saved; and to combine the military power of Europe against free institutions, against the press, against the spirit of liberty and patriotism which had sprung up in the glorious struggle with Napoleon, against the right of the people to exert an influence on the governments by which their dearest interests were to be controlled. Never be it forgotten, that such was the honour of sovereigns, such their requital for the blood which had been shed freely in their defence. Freedom and humanity send up a solemn and prevailing cry against them to that tribunal, where kings and subjects are soon to stand as equals.

But still we should be strangely blind, if we were not to feel that the fall of Napoleon was a blessing to the world. Who can look, for example, at France, and not see there a degree of freedom which could never have grown up under the terrible frown of the usurper? True, Bonaparte's life, though it seemed a charmed one, must at length have ended; and we are told, that then his empire would have been broken, and that the general crash, by some inexplicable process, would have given birth to a more extensive and durable liberty than can now be hoped. But such anticipations seem to us to be built on a strange inattention to the nature and inevitable consequences of Napoleon's power. It was wholly a military power. He was literally turning Europe into a camp, and drawing its best talent into one occupation, war. Thus Europe was retracing its steps to those ages of calamity and darkness, when the only law was the sword. The progress of centuries, which had consisted chiefly in the substitution of intelligence, public opinion, and other mild and rational influences, for brutal

force, was to be reversed. At Bonaparte's death, his empire must, indeed, have been dissolved; but military chiefs, like Alexander's lieutenants, would have divided it. The sword alone would have shaped its future communities; and after years of desolation and bloodshed, Europe would have found, not repose, but a respite, an armed truce, under warriors, whose only title to empire would have been their own good blades, and the weight of whose thrones would have been upheld by military force alone. Amidst such convulsions, during which the press would have been every where fettered, and the military spirit would have triumphed over and swallowed up the spirit and glory of letters and liberal arts, we greatly fear, that the human intellect would have lost its present impulse, its thirst for progress, and would have fallen back towards barbarism. Let not the friends of freedom bring dishonour on themselves or desert their cause, by instituting comparisons between Napoleon and legitimate sovereigns, which may be contrued into eulogies on the former. For ourselves, we have no sympathy with tyranny, whether it bear the name of usurpation or legitimacy. We are not pleading the cause of the allied sovereigns. In our judgment, they have contracted the very guilt against which they have pretended to combine. In our apprehension, a conspiracy against the rights of the human race, is as foul a crime as rebellion against the rights of sovereigns; nor is there less of treason in warring against public freedom, than in assailing royal power. Still we are bound in truth to confess, that the allied sovereigns are not to be ranked with Bonaparte, whose design against the independence of nations, and the liberties of the world, in this age of civilization, liberal thinking, and Christian knowledge, is, in our estimation, the most nefarious enterprise recorded in history.

"The series of events which it has been our province to review, offers subjects of profound thought and solemn instruction to the moralist and politician. We have retraced it with many painful feelings. It shows us a great people, who had caught some indistinct glimpses of freedom, and of a nobler and a happier political constitution, betrayed by their leaders, and brought back, by a military despot, to heavier chains than they had broken. We see with indignation, one man, a man like ourselves, subjecting whole nations to his absolute rule. It is this wrong and insult to our race which has chiefly moved us. Had a storm of God's ordination passed over Europe, prostrating its capitals, sweeping off its villages, burying millions in ruins, we should have wept, we should have trembled. But in this there would have been only wretchedness. Now we also see debasement. To us there is something radically, and increasingly shocking, in the thought of one man's will becoming a law to his race; in the thought of multitudes, of vast communities, surrendering conscience, intellect, their affections, their rights, their interests, to the stern mandate of a fellow creature. When we see one word of a frail man on the throne of France, tearing a hundred thousand sons from their homes, breaking asunder the sacred ties of domestic

life, sentencing myriads of the young to make murder their calling, and rapacity their means of support, and extorting from nations their treasures to extend this ruinous sway, we are ready to ask ourselves, Is not this a dream? And when the sad reality comes home to us, we blush for a race which can stoop to such an abject lot. At length, indeed, we see the tyrant humbled, stripped of power; but stripped by those who, with one exception, are not unwilling to play the despot on a narrower scale, and to break down the spirit of nations under the same iron sway.

"How is it, that tyranny has thus triumphed? that the hopes with which we greeted the French Revolution have been crushed? that a usurper plucked up the last roots of the tree of liberty, and planted despotism in its place? The chief cause is not far to seek, nor can it be too often urged on the friends of freedom. France failed through the want of that moral preparation for liberty, without which the blessing cannot be secured. She was not ripe for the good she sought. She was too corrupt for freedom. France had indeed to contend with great political ignorance; but had not ignorance been reinforced by deep moral defect, she might have won her way to free institutions. Her character forbade her to be free; and it now seems strange that we could ever have expected her to secure this boon. How could we believe, that a liberty, of which that heartless scoffer, Voltaire, was a chief apostle, could have triumphed? Most of the preachers of French liberty had thrown off all the convictions which ennoble the mind. Man's connexion with God they broke, for they declared, that there was no God in whom to trust in the great struggle for liberty. Human immortality, that truth which is the seed of all greatness, they derided. To their philosophy, man was a creature of chance, a compound of matter, an ephemeron, a worm, who was soon to rot and perish for ever. What insanity was it to expect, that such men were to work out the emancipation of their race! that in such hands the hopes and dearest rights of humanity were secure! Liberty was tainted by their touch, polluted by their breath, and yet we trusted that it was to rise in health and glory from their embrace. We looked to men, who openly founded morality on private interest, for the sacrifices, the devotion, the heroic virtue, which freedom always demands from her assertors.

"The great cause of the discomfiture of the late European struggle for liberty, is easily understood by an American, who recurs to the history of his own revolution. This issued prosperously, because it was begun and was conducted under the auspices of private and public virtue. Our liberty did not come to us by accident, nor was it the gift of a few leaders; but its seeds were sown plentifully in the minds of the whole people. It was rooted in the conscience and reason of the nation. It was the growth of deliberate convictions and generous principles liberally diffused. We had no Paris, no metropolis, which a few leaders swayed, and which sent forth its influences, like "a mighty heart," through dependent and subservient provinces. The country was all heart. The living principle pervaded the community, and every village

added strength to the solemn purpose of being free. We have here an explanation of a striking fact in the history of our revolution; we mean the want or absence of that description of great men, whom we meet in other countries; men, who, by their distinct and single agency, and by their splendid deeds, determine a nation's fate. There was too much greatness in the American people, to admit this overshadowing greatness of leaders. Accordingly, the United States had no liberator, no political saviour. Washington indeed conferred on us great blessings. But Washington was not a hero in the common sense of that word. We never spoke of him as the French did of Bonaparte, never talked of his eagle-eyed, irresistible genius, as if this were to work out our safety. We never lost our self-respect. We felt that, under God, we were to be free through our own courage, energy, and wisdom, under the animating and guiding influences of this great and good mind. Washington served us chiefly by his sublime moral qualities, and not by transcendent talent, which, we apprehend, he did not possess. To him belonged the proud distinction of being the leader in a revolution, without awakening one doubt or solicitude as to the spotless purity of his purpose. His was the glory of being the brightest manifestation of the spirit which reigned in his country; and in this way he become a source of energy, a bond of union, the centre of an enlightened people's confidence. In such a revolution as that of France, Washington would have been nothing; for that sympathy which subsisted between him and his fellow citizens, and which was the secret of his power, would have been wanting. By an instinct which is unerring, we call Washington, with grateful reverence, the Father of his Country, but not its Saviour. A people which wants a saviour, which does not possess an earnest and pledge of freedom in its own heart, is not yet ready to be free.

"A great question here offers itself, at which we can only glance. If a moral preparation is required for freedom, how, it is asked, can Europe ever be free? How, under the despotisms which now crush the continent, can nations grow ripe for liberty? Is it to be hoped, that men will learn, in the school of slavery, the spirit and virtues, which, we are told, can alone work out their deliverance? In the absolute governments of Europe, the very instruments of forming an enlightened and generous love of freedom, are bent into the service of tyranny. The press is an echo of the servile doctrines of the court. The schools and seminaries of education are employed to taint the young mind with the maxims of despotism. Even Christianity is turned into a preacher of legitimacy, and its temples are desecrated by the abject teaching of unconditional submission. How, then, is the spirit of a wise and moral freedom to be generated and diffused? We have stated the difficulty in its full force; for nothing is gained by winking out of sight the tremendous obstacles, with which liberal principles and institutions must contend. We have not time at present to answer the great question now proposed. We will only say, that we do not despair; and we will briefly suggest what seems to us the chief expedient, by which the cause of freedom, obstructed as

it is, must now be advanced. In despotic countries, those men, whom God hath inspired with lofty sentiments and a thirst for freedom (and such are spread through all Europe), must, in their individual capacity, communicate themselves to individual minds. The cause of liberty on the continent cannot now be forwarded by the action of men in masses. But in every country there are those who feel their degradation and their wrongs, who abhor tyranny as the chief obstruction of the progress of nations, and who are willing and prepared to suffer for liberty. Let such men spread around them their own spirit, by every channel which a jealous despotism has not closed. Let them give utterance to sentiments of magnanimity in private conference, and still more by the press; for there are modes of clothing and expressing kindling truths, which, it is presumed, no censorship would dare to proscribe. Let them especially teach that great truth, which is the seminal principle of a virtuous freedom, and the very foundation of morals and religion; we mean, the doctrine, that conscience, the voice of God in every heart, is to be listened to above all other guides and lords; that there is a sovereign within us, clothed with more awful powers and rights than any outward king; and that he alone is worthy the name of a man, who gives himself up solemnly, deliberately, to obey this internal guide through peril and in death. This is the spirit of freedom; for no man is wholly and immutably free, but he who has broken every outward yoke, that he may obey his own deliberate conscience. This is the lesson to be taught alike in republics and despotisms. As yet it has but dawned on the world. Its full application remains to be developed. They who have been baptized, by a true experience, into this vital and all-comprehending truth, must every where be its propagators; and he who makes one convert to it near a despot's throne, has broken one link of that despot's chain. It is chiefly in the diffusion of this loftiness of moral sentiment, that we place our hope of freedom; and we have a hope, because we know that there are those who have drunk into this truth, and are ready, when God calls, to be its martyrs. We do not despair, for there is a contagion, we would rather say, a divine power in sublime moral principle. This is our chief trust. We have less and less hope from force and bloodshed, as the instruments of working out man's redemption from slavery. History shows us not a few princes, who have gained or strengthened thrones by assassination or war. But freedom, which is another name for justice, honour, and benevolence, scorns to use the private dagger, and wields with trembling the public sword. The true conspiracy, before which tyranny is to fall, is that of virtuous, elevated minds, which shall consecrate themselves to the work of awakening in men a consciousness of the rights, powers, purposes, and greatness of human nature; which shall oppose to force, the heroism of intellect and conscience, and the spirit of self-sacrifice. We believe that, at this moment, there are virtue and wisdom enough to shake despotic thrones, were they as confiding as they should be in God and in their own might, and were they to pour themselves through every channel into the public mind.

"We close our present labours, with commending to the protection of Almighty God, the cause of human freedom and improvement. We adore the wisdom and goodness of his providence, which has ordained, that liberty shall be wrought out by the magnanimity, courage, and sacrifices of men. We bless him for the glorious efforts which this cause has already called forth; for the intrepid defenders who have gathered round it, and whose fame is a most precious legacy of past ages; for the toils and sufferings by which it has been upheld; for the awakening and thrilling voice which comes to us from the dungeon and scaffold, where the martyrs of liberty have pined or bled. We bless him, that even tyranny has been overruled for good, by exciting a resistance which has revealed to us the strength of virtuous principle in the human soul. We beseech this Great and Good Parent, from whom all pure influences proceed, to enkindle, by his quickening breath, an unquenchable love of virtue and freedom in those favoured men, whom he hath enriched and signalized by eminent gifts and powers, that they may fulfil the high function of inspiring their fellow beings with a consciousness of the birthright and destination of human nature. Wearied with violence and blood, we beseech him to subvert oppressive governments, by the gentle yet awful power of truth and virtue; by the teachings of uncorrupted Christianity; by the sovereignty of enlightened opinion; by the triumph of sentiments of magnanimity; by mild, rational, and purifying influences, which will raise the spirit of the enslaved, and which sovereigns will be unable to withstand. For this peaceful revolution we earnestly pray. If, however, after long forbearing, and unavailing applications to justice and humanity, the friends of freedom should be summoned, by the voice of God within, and by his providence abroad, to vindicate their rights with other arms, to do a sterner work, to repel despotic force by force, may they not forget, even in this hour of provocation, the spirit which their high calling demands. Let them take the sword with awe, as those on whom a holy function is devolved. Let them regard themselves as ministers and delegates of Him, whose dearest attribute is Mercy. Let them not stain their sacred cause by one cruel deed, by the infliction of one needless pang, by shedding without cause one drop of human blood."

A New-Year's-Day Discourse.

(Concluded from page 309.)

THESE considerations lead me to observe upon the latter verse of my text, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." These words contain an *urgency* and an *assurance*. The change it proposes is complete, absolute, and entire: the difference to be effected is as striking and discernible as that between the oblivion and repose of sleep, and the animated

movement, and sparkling and powerful intelligence of consciousness; as that between darkness and light, life and death. What state is this denoted by the Apostle, under the forcible imagery of "sleep" and "death"? The state of *sin*—the state in exact opposition to that which bears the "fruit of the Spirit, in all goodness, and righteousness, and truth, proving what is acceptable unto the Lord.

It becomes us, then, to inquire if there be any of us not yet awake to the recognition of the peculiar nature of the calling, which is ours in Christ Jesus, of the "sacrifices" we are required to "burn without the camp," that with "boldness" we may "enter into the holiest, drawing near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience;" of the self-denying ordinance, we should impose upon the rebellious movements of the passions, even the "denying ungodliness and worldly lust, and keeping unspotted from the world;" of the zeal with which it is expected from us, that we should press into the "chambers of imagery, and bring out one abomination after another, and slay them before the Lord." Now, should there be any of us who yet "sleep" in perilous contempt of these considerations, oh! let him "awake," let him shake off the cold and fatal palsy that paralyzes him, let him, in the powerful language of Scripture, "arise from the dead!" And should there be one present whose mind is stirred to a sense of his insecurity, whose desires after holiness are as those of a "thirsty soul after cold water," the "rock" of whose heart "is smote, that the waters" of remorse are gushing out, and the "streams" of contrition "overflowing;" who entertains the holy purpose and sincere resolve, of freeing himself from the fetters of a dangerous and degrading indulgence, let him reflect, that "*now* is the appointed time, *now* is the day of salvation!" Another criminal compliance may rivet his chains, those chains "a yoke of iron on thy neck" *for ever!* Another opportunity of being roused from the lethargy of sin, may be denied! Another hour may find you beyond any note of warning, be it urged in as moving terms, and with as loud and impressive an emphasis, as it may! Another *hour!* Ay! ere another cadence may find utterance from these lips, one of you who are now assembled before me, in all the unconcern of a positive self-security, may be struck a convulsed and blackened corpse, at the feet of

those who now press so closely and fondly beside you; and the light and flexile form of childhood, towards which your mother's heart yearns with so fond and anxious a solicitude, may grow cold and rigid, and drop a withered bud into your bosom; or the smooth and open brow of female loveliness may become shrunken, and her eye of splendour darkened, and her cheek of bloom be shrivelled like a soiled and trodden rose-leaf; or the hoary locks of venerated paternity, sweep the dust from beneath your feet! Oh! may the appalling suggestion animate us all to the putting forth of an immediate and powerful and persevering agency, in ridding ourselves from the trammels of early sinful habit—in subduing every unholy appetite—in "so running, as not uncertainly—in so fighting, as not one that beateth the air"—in purifying from all defilement the holy temple of God,—"which temple are ye," "that it may be filled with the brightness of the Lord's glory." Oh! may it summon us, by the power of all its heart-rending associations, and all its solemn and affecting imagery, and all its fearful and possible reality, to "awake from sleep, and arise from the dead," supported by the encouraging assurance, that "Christ shall give us light." When temptations assail us, sore to the overcoming, and our hearts sink dispirited beneath the burthen of the conflict, and our powers of resisting are fast ebbing before the intensity and continuance of the struggle, then shall the assurance, that "Christ shall give us light," infuse fresh vigour into our exhausted spirits, and supply increased energy to our failing resolves, and nerve our minds to more determined efforts, to more persevering and unyielding resistance. When our spiritual affections grow cold and inert, and the visible realities of sense shut out from our contemplation the invisible realities of faith, and our hearts droop in listless despondency beneath the enervating influence of unusual and overstrained excitement, or the depressing contact of worldly relations, pursuits, and prospects—then will we bear in mind, that it is God who hath "set darkness in our path," who hath "stripped us of our glory, and taken the crown from our head," and recurring to the assurance, that "Christ shall gave us light," lift up our face unto God, and say, "There is lifting up." When prostrate in prayer before the throne of grace, we plume our spirit for the solemn flight, and bend our might to sweep the unfathomable range, and kindle the mind's eye

to the vast survey of eternity, but fall back on the first feeble rising, faint and powerless, dazzled, overwhelmed, confounded by the immensity of his nature, and the infinity of his perfections, and an opaque veil of doubt and dread seems as though it were closing in upon our souls, smothering all our heavenward tendencies; and we feel as though neglected and abandoned by our God, we were left to the sway of our unruly wills and headstrong passions, exposed to the snares and attractions of a seducing world—then will we bring to mind the assurance of the text, that "Christ shall give us light," and in patient waiting, and humble submissive confidence, possess our souls in peace. And when we approach the dark and silent chambers of the dead, and the chill moisture of the grave settles heavily upon the heart, and we shrink dismayed before the appalling visitation, with timid anticipations and distracting doubts—then shall the assurance, that "Christ shall give us light," shoot athwart the gloomy void, a bright and cheering ray, and with a sacred halo, gild the tomb.

May the great and good God, in his infinite mercy, guide and support your steps through this present year, and grant that it may prove a portion of that "strait and narrow path, that leadeth to life everlasting." Amen.

The World, a State of Probation.

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." The decree of unerring Wisdom fulfilled by omnipotent Power, must produce those effects, and those only, which the Deity contemplated. There could not possibly be any vacillation in council, or uncertainty in result, but the design which the Almighty had in view, in calling the world and its inhabitants into existence, must be fulfilled; to deny this, is to deny, or, which is the same thing, to limit the attributes of God.

Man is deemed to be the noblest work of the divine Architect. For what purpose, then, are we created? What the object and design to be accomplished? From the constitution of man, we conclude, that being gifted with the perception of, we are also fitted for, the enjoyment of happiness; and argue, that such enjoyment must be the intention of pure benevolence.

And the situation in which we are placed, seems designed and admirably fitted to produce this result; for

although present and unalloyed happiness is not always attainable, we must bear in mind, that the purposes of God are not limited to this life merely, but extend to a future state; the present being one of trial and probation, intended to prepare us for futurity. This is indeed the glorious burthen of that Revelation which God has beneficently vouchsafed to us, and is fully corroborated to the contemplative mind, by an examination of the numberless events continually occurring.

In possession, then, of appetites and passions which incite us to action, and which are continually called into exercise by the various diversified situations, which the checkered path of life produces, we are endowed with mental faculties by which to govern them. As a farther assistance, the Almighty has condescended to grant us a revelation of his most holy will, a code of laws by which to regulate our conduct; and this revelation, by the restraint which it imposes, promotes our happiness.

By revelation, we become acquainted with *sin* and its converts; had it not been bestowed, we could not have committed sin, because sin is the transgression of an existing, familiar, and understood law; nor could any one in such a case be chargeable with blame, who followed implicitly the dictates of his passions, because it would be impossible to conceive of any efficient counteracting influence. A species of subordinate check, might indeed be sometimes opposed to an unrestrained career, by the efforts of reason and judgment, by a cautious consideration of the probable consequences which would arise from giving way indiscriminately to every varying impulse. But this, so far from being a general rule, would only be an occasional decision as to the prudence, under existing circumstances, of acting in obedience to those desires which in a greater or less degree influence the will.

Thus intimately adapted to the situation and propensities of the human race, is the guide of revelation; to it we owe the distinction between virtue and vice: virtue or righteousness, by keeping the passions in strict subjection and obedience, and in all things obeying the commands of God, even when opposed to that line of conduct apparently best suited to our worldly interests: vice and sin, when the commands of God are partially or completely disregarded, but every instigation of the passions obeyed, and every dictate of the will executed. Nor is

the constitution of virtue and vice *arbitrary*. It might be conceived, that supposing pleasure to result merely from animal enjoyment, revelation does not conduce to it, because our natural feelings prompt us to view its commands as burthensome, by placing us under restraint in the gratification of our appetites, and denying us unlimited sensual indulgence, the sources, we are prone to consider, of all our happiness. But it cannot be denied that unbounded sensuality and ungoverned passions, are invariably productive of misery, and that the regular practice of virtue really produces a high degree of happiness even in this life, and that the restraints imposed upon us are necessary to produce individual as well as general felicity, and that where they are observed, such will be the indisputable result. A further proof that the constitution of vice and virtue is not arbitrary, is to be found in the fact, that unlimited obedience to our appetites and passions, and the gratification of every individual, without regard to others, is not possible, nor even practicable to any great extent. Society cannot exist without laws, by which the desires of every individual are controlled for the good of the whole, and without which, if men were to have no rule but their own will or caprice, were to grant every latitude to their inordinate wishes, and promote to the utmost, their own pleasure and gratification, reckless of that of others, nothing but anarchy and misery could possibly result. Thus the necessity of restraint, as conducive to happiness, is fully proved by the laws and institution of mankind.

But it may be asked, if God intended us for enjoyment, why place us in such an artificial situation—why not grant it to us at once—and why render us liable to so much pain and misery? It may be replied, that to resist temptation, and conquer difficulty, tends to produce happiness, prepares us for more intense enjoyment, and renders us more susceptible of its influence. Happiness is a comparison of sensations; without pain, we cannot become really acquainted with ease; the blessing of health is appreciated by the intervention of sickness; and adversity is necessary, to our placing a due estimate upon, and enjoying pleasure from, successful exertions. By resisting temptations, overcoming difficulties, and struggling with obstacles in this life, we become fitted for the enjoyment of another. Without an acquaintance with pain and evil,

without being strengthened and chastened by adversity, without being tried and purified by privation and suffering, not even heaven, constituted as we are, could impart happiness, nor man be capable, without being purged and refined by passing through a probationary state, of attaining to the enjoyment of pure and unalloyed felicity. Thus, the present situation of man, and the multifarious contingencies to which he is exposed, corroborate the teachings of Revelation, in unison with the design of infinite benevolence, that he is placed here as in a school, to be fitted and prepared for another and superior state of existence—of never-ending happiness.

Many Christians, however, do not admit this conclusion, and scruple not to affirm that the present state of things was not originally intended by the Creator, but that a lamentable change took place by the fall of our common progenitor Adam; that all things were made beautiful, lovely, and glorious; that Adam sprang from the plastic hand of his Creator in his image, a virtuous and an immortal being, but that by his subsequent transgression, he entailed a curse upon creation, and bequeathed to his posterity a nature radically evil and corrupt. This nature which some delight to paint in the most horrid and appalling colours; this innate depravity, consequent on the original sin of Adam, is the onerous burthen under which mortality is doomed to groan. The imputed consequences are indeed tremendous! The wrath of the Almighty is directed against the sins of his creatures; and as all are inheritors of one common depraved nature, all are therefore sentenced to condemnation! Adam, by one single action, plunged, it seems, the Godhead into a dilemma (for such must be the only conclusion deducible) by which, on the one hand, he must leave the unfortunate creatures of his power to their horrid doom, or, on the other, condescend himself to satisfy the demands of his own justice, because an infinite sacrifice only can be an equivalent for infinite sins; the Eternal must veil himself in humanity, to submit to torture and to death,

> "The Almighty God comes down to bleed,
> And nourish dying worms!"

Such a system militates against the omniscience of Deity, destroys his mercy, and annihilates his justice. It erects the fabled influence of necessity, or fate, into an Omnipotent power to which he is subservient; and involves

the conclusion, that all men, Adam excepted, are called into existence for the sole purpose of being damned—a catastrophe which can only be prevented by God himself bearing the tortures of *that* state, and offering a sacrifice for sin, in order to save his creatures from the stern decree of necessity. Thus, the orthodox version of Christianity, presents features of near resemblance to the reveries of ancient philosophy, and creates a paramount unalterable principle which annihilates the attributes of God, and makes him a limited and inferior being.

To show that neither nature nor revelation countenance this heart-withering system, will be attempted in a subsequent communication.

D.

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

Glasgow, *July* 1, 1828.

On Wednesday, June 18, a Dinner, at which his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex presided, was given by the Protestant Dissenters, at the Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen-Street, London, in commemoration of the Repeal of the Sacramental Test. The company was numerous and highly respectable, and the speeches were worthy of the occasion. The liberal sentiments which emanated from the Royal Chairman and the other speakers, must, we are persuaded, find a willing response in every Christian bosom: the loud and reiterated applause with which they were hailed on their delivery, is a proof, if one were wanting, that they were not uttered in vain. We are sorry that our limits prevent us from giving more than a few of the speeches. The Duke of Sussex, on his health being given, said—

"Gentlemen, I rise, I assure you, with feelings of considerable emotion, to return thanks to you for the manner in which you have received the toast just proposed to you. If I should say that I do not feel proud and gratified, I should be ungrateful, and I should say what is not true. I do feel pride—I assure you, real satisfactory pride—at seeing myself surrounded by so many warm hearts and strong minds, pursuing a course perfectly consistent with sound constitutional principles, and claiming a right for themselves—and, while they are claiming that right for themselves, they will not, I am sure, forget that they are in duty bound also to claim it for others. When I look round, and see "what stuff" this Meeting is made of—I am not speaking of articles but of matter—but when I see what materials this Meeting is composed of—when I see the stuff that still exists in the world, collected in a Meeting like this—I say, be firm, be temperate but consistent, pursuing your course strictly in consistency with the principles of the Constitution, and you will be sure not to fail in any thing, when you have reason and justice for the associates of your cause. Gentlemen, my respected Friend, in proposing my health

to you as a toast, connected it with the principles which placed my family on the throne. Gentlemen, I intend to support those principles. Gentlemen, it is my duty to support them; I like those principles. But, Gentlemen, I mean to look those principles in the face; I wish them to be fully acted on. I know no reduction of them—no frittering them away; I know of no impediments in their way. Mine is a straight-forward road; and I believe a conscientious opinion is that which, on all occasions, gives the best advice. As to actions, I have always been taught from my childhood, to love my fellow-creatures as myself—I was always told to do as I would be done by. In a world of ups and downs, where characters and ranks are established in society for convenience—and by convenience, it must happen that some are placed higher than others, but those persons who are so placed by Divine Providence, must look on their high station as calling them to fulfil higher duties—I conceive such men are bound to promote the best interests of their country; and I must say, that I think I am doing my duty to God and my country, in acting as I act on the present occasion. Gentlemen, I may not have the art of oratory; I am a strong-headed man, and a plain spoken man—and people cannot easily deceive me—I am not in office, and I thank God that I am not. I am not in a situation to have a political keeper of my conscience. When I am told a fact, or I hear a chain of reasoning which I am not able to answer, I do not give my assent to it; I go home; I consider the subject; and very often I find that what I have been told is not true. When I find it so, and an opportunity offers, I think it my duty to come forward and state my opinion, and let those who have argued the matter before, argue it again, taking with them a little additional common sense. I dislike this way of going on, and so I will leave the subject. It is scarcely necessary for me to tell you, that looking at the history of the time when the Statutes now repealed were enacted, and looking at the feelings of the parties, I must say that those Statutes were a disgrace to the Statute-book. They are not the only Statutes which are such a disgrace. When I look at the Statute-book, I see other Statutes equally horrible, and I trust in God they will soon be got rid of. I find a great many other such Statutes, though it is not the time for us to discuss their propriety in this room. When I look through the page of history, and trace all the circumstances connected with the origin of those Statutes, and look at the feelings of those by whom they were enacted, and the general feelings of the times, I must say, these laws seem to me to have been made on principles, and under the influence of feelings, which we know little or nothing of, now that we are arrived at a certain period of manhood. We are often told to look at what our ancestors did; to which I answer, that I am older than my ancestors. To the experience of my ancestors, I may add the experience of the present time. I say that I ought to know more than they knew—to judge better—and to act more wisely than my ancestors acted. Having got so far, allow me to add, that this is a peculiar day on which we are called on to celebrate this great event. It is one of the greatest days in the history of England—a day on which an event occurred which led to the greatest results. It is the Anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo. It is also commemorated on this day. I should like to ask the gallant men who went into battle, when the order for the charge and the attack was given, whether, in acting each his brilliant part, he asked his comrade, of what religion he was, what was his faith, and what Church he belonged to? I believe not. The word was victory, and the glory of our country. That was the common bond of union. There was but one feeling at that moment, and are there to be different feelings at a different period? I take it, that all those who fell on that ground, who had acted properly, were not neglected by the Great Being who causes his sun to shine for

the highest and the lowest; and, though it is not for an humble individual like me to judge of that benign Being, I doubt not that he received all those men into his grace. And shall we, as individuals, pass judgment on those whom, as individuals, our Maker does not condemn? I say, then, that the way to get rid of this question, is to give all the individuals of the country an interest in it, to ensure them a full share of happiness, and so we shall interest them in promoting the prosperity of the country. Under these impressions, I will not detain you any longer. But it is impossible that I should conclude my speech, which comes, I assure you, from my heart, without alluding to this subject—for I see around me several Noble Lords and Gentlemen of importance, who have not had the good fortune to arrive at a situation similar to yours, but which I trust they will reach, and that we shall proceed on the principles we have now begun." [His Royal Highness was loudly applauded during the course of his speech, and the cheering which followed its conclusion was immense.]

When Lord Holland's health had been proposed by the Royal Chairman, and the cheering had subsided, his Lordship said—

"He felt himself utterly inadequate to express his sense of the grateful feeling manifested by the Meeting at the mention of his name, and more particularly for the manner in which the Illustrious Chairman had associated it with the great event they had met to commemorate. He felt this the more especially, in reference to the compliments that had been paid him as the author of that tone and temper which seemed to be the harbingers of the completion of the religious freedom of the country. He would not attempt to return thanks for the kindness the Meeting had shown him; but he trusted they would not, therefore, attribute to him that he was insensible to the exertions making by the friends of religious liberty. So far from it, it was his opinion, that as to the malignant, wicked, and impolitic nature of the laws that remained unaltered, no doubt could exist; and it was his conviction, that advantage and benefit had resulted to the country, not only to the Protestant Dissenters, but to persons of all denominations, from the discussion of this question. The public feeling in its favour had increased, and was increasing ever since the repeal had taken place. The expectations of very great and good men in former times, were now, he believed, fairly about to be completed. He did not think he was using a hyperbole, when he said, that the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts was little less than the restoration of the Constitution of England to its rightful owners. They were its rightful owners, for the real owners of the Constitution of the land were the people. The repeal of these Corporation and Test Acts had destroyed the monopoly that existed; but there were frightful and dreadful exceptions to this rule. But he called on the Meeting to consider, that either by the ancient Constitution, or the common law of the land, every man who contributed to the expenses of the State, and who was born within his Majesty's dominions, was fully entitled to the same equal enjoyment of civil rights as others. By the statute law, passed during the reign of Charles II. and continued during the last 150 years, it appeared that, in theory—he would not say in direct practice, but in theory and principle, the rights of one class of persons depended entirely on the forbearance of another class. That monopoly was gone. He knew it would be said that the restrictions did not practically exist, because out of their great grace and favour, they had frequently admitted others to participate with them in the benefits. It had been said, that this was the same as having the right. But [continued the Noble Lord] I say, and you will agree with me, that those who fancy that the enjoyment of political liberty and of political power, for they are synonimous, by sufferance and by right is the same thing, have grossly misunderstood

this question; and that those who enter into the enjoyment of political liberty by permission hardly deserve the use of it. He understood that the Constitution of England was the birthright of all Englishmen. There might be exceptions; but if there were, the burthen of proof was thrown on the shoulders of those who made them. He was aware that a large class was still excepted in this country. It gave him the greatest possible satisfaction to hear these sentiments expressed by the illustrious Prince in the Chair, which had been echoed and re-echoed by the room. He had rejoiced when he heard these sentiments so supported; but he was not surprised when he considered that, in the first place, they were the natural consequence of the principles they professed. He had been often told that the great body of Protestant Dissenters were not friendly to the particular measure to which he alluded; but he had always considered that statement as a calumny. In private and in public, in all societies and in all meetings, he had constantly maintained the contrary. He had always stated that the great body of the Protestant Dissenters rested their complaints, on a principle so bound up with all the principles of political and religious liberty, that it was utterly impossible, whatever might be their difference of tenets on theological points, that there should not be a time, when the necessity of applying that principle to the whole community would not be less agreeable to it than to the Dissenters themselves. In this opinion, I have been most gloriously confirmed. I knew it was a foul calumny; and when I look to the right and to the left, I must tell you, that what I say now I do in justice to the Roman Catholics of England. I thought it my duty to tell them, that as they had heard that some of the most respectable members of the community of Dissenters were adverse to their claims, in my opinion it was not true. I did not believe they could claim rights for themselves which they would withhold from any others. It is due, besides, to the Roman Catholics to state, that the most eminent persons among them were favourable to these measures; and that that excellent person the Duke of Norfolk stated expressly, that whatever the repeal of the Test Act might effect, he begged for himself and the Roman Catholics, it might be understood that they wished that Parliament might act on the principles of justice. Let justice be done, said the Noble Duke, whatever the consequences may be. In my conscience, I believe that if the Duke of Norfolk was convinced that the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts would indirectly have injured his own cause, if he had been called upon, as he ought to have been, to give his vote in Parliament on the subject, it would have been in favour of it. This being the case, it was certainly not more than I expected from the overflowing sympathy of your minds, that you should hail those arguments which have been enforced by the Illustrious Prince in the Chair. Our Illustrious Chairman has also alluded to the fact, of this being the Anniversary of the Victory of Waterloo. This is a subject on which I do not wish here any further to comment, than to remark, that

'Peace has her triumphs, and not less than war;'

and when I consider the course followed on other occasions by the Noble Duke at the head of the Government, I should rejoice if he would lend his aid to complete the triumph of religious liberty. I cannot help saying, that with his aid or without it, I think it must succeed. I trust in the justice of the case, that it will be successful, from its analogy to those cases which have succeeded. Considering the increased and increasing progress of the times, the voice of the people must have some effect on the Legislature and on the Ministers of the Crown. Let us at least show that we do not abandon our principles on this glorious day, when, by adhering to them, we have so great reason to expect that we can extend them not only to all bodies, but to all individuals who call for relief. When I consider how many great persons of genius, now departed, have

given their authority to this principle—and when I also think how many living authorities we have—and when I consider how enlightened the body of Protestant Dissenters is, and the enlightened character of the times, I cannot help hoping that

'Persuasion yet may do the work of fear.'

In the tone and temper with which the question is now discussed, there is much of the spirit of real conciliation, not to Ireland only, but to the whole empire, and, I may say, to mankind at large."

After some other very interesting toasts and speeches had been given, the Duke of Sussex proposed—

"The Protestant Dissenting Ministers, the worthy successors of the ever-memorable 2,000 who sacrificed interest to conscience."

On this toast having been received with much enthusiasm, the Rev. Mr. Aspland said—

"He rose, at the request of the Committee, to thank the Meeting for the honour they had done to the toast just drank; and, though the Dissenting Ministers were but an humble body, nevertheless they might be allowed to feel some small share of pride in the triumph of those great principles to which their fathers had been devoted; and though they could not boast of their undaunted conduct as it had been displayed in former times, yet at least they might lay claim to the same love of freedom. But when he praised them, he begged that it might not be considered that he was doing so as a sectarian: he could not do so; for he remembered, when those of the Church of England at the time of the Reformation had sacrificed every thing in the same way; and they were still looking with admiration to the Ministers of the Catholic religion, who, in a time when charity and justice were trampled under foot, had made the same sacrifice for conscience' sake. When, therefore, he spoke of the merits of the 2,000 Dissenters, he was willing to admit an equal claim to merit on the part of 2,000 of the Established Church, and on the part of another 2,000 of the Roman Catholic religion; and these 6,000 might together claim everlasting honour. It had been well said by a bishop who had in former days supported the cause of religious liberty, 'I am not afraid of men of scrupulous sentiments, but of men who believe in every thing, subscribe to every thing, and vote for every thing;' and he thought it but right that it should be remembered, that the Dissenters had been most active in placing the present august family on the throne; and therefore no Member of that illustrious House would feel surprised, if, in spite of the restrictions under which the Dissenters had been labouring, they should still support the same principles, [hear, hear! from the Duke of Sussex], even though a Member of that Family might by chance forget the principles that had placed it on the throne! [loud cheers.] He also begged to be allowed to express his happiness—not for his own sake, but for that of his children and his children's children—that he was able to look upon the repeal of the Sacramental Test as a pledge to the country, that other Tests would be shortly conceded by Government, and also by those Corporations—those learned Corporations, which had hitherto exercised so great a power, and owing to which, he thought that their mother country had dealt with her dissenting children somewhat hardly, giving them, hitherto, nothing but the crumbs to feed upon: he trusted, however, that shortly her maternal bosom would be opened to all, and that she would receive them into her cordial embraces, so that hereafter the Dissenters might hope to have a fair portion of the children's bread."

The Royal Chairman, after various other toasts, then proposed the health of "Mr. Brougham, and Education without Subscription

to Articles of Faith." Mr. Brougham, when the reiterated cheering had subsided, said,

"I beg the company, and your Royal Highness, to accept my best thanks, and most hearty congratulations—my best thanks for so kindly coupling my name with education, unfettered with subscription to any particular faith—and which is to me a matter of most peculiar gratification; for no one can be a more warm or zealous friend than I am to education, entirely unconnected with any religious tenets whatsoever. Let them be called tests, or oaths, or declarations, or subscriptions; in short, call them by what name you will, I know that they are as abhorrent to common sense as to justice—and equally so to all sound policy or principle; I know that they are traps for men's consciences—that they are baits for men's virtue—and that they will not testify men's principles, but merely fall as a burthen of injustice on the good and the honest, making a mockery of the most sacred of things. If there were any that wished their children to enter seminaries where a subscription to a certain faith was necessary, in God's name, let such seminaries exist. I am not against such a proposition; but all I ask in return is, that they will leave us alone to throw our doors open to those who entertain a contrary opinion, and who would have their children educated without being called upon to subscribe any test of faith. But I will not detain you any longer by talking of that which has been well termed the origin of this great triumph; if it is more or less owing to the improvement in knowledge in the people of this country—and I think that no one can doubt that such is the case—I have a right to say, that I feel additional pleasure at having my name coupled with the sentiment of education. The real question is, not whether we all entertain exactly the same sentiments on religious subjects, but whether we are not all bound to support, by co-operation, the common end that we have in view; and whether we should not be encouraged to continue working in that cause which neither the delay of craftiness can damp, nor open resistance subdue. It is, then, to that union, forbearance, and determination, that we, in a great measure, owe our present triumph: and I have no doubt that a continuation of those feelings will produce us many more triumphs of the same sort. It was by this same means that the African slave-trade was checked twenty years ago, and it is to the same means that we must look (under the goodness of Providence) for the final extirpation of West India slavery. In fine, it is to the same means, that (as it has been well expressed) the enlarged and enlarging advance in religious liberty is owing, as well as the concession of civil rights to all classes of our fellow subjects. And I cannot help expecting that this will not be the last occasion on which I shall meet you within these walls, for the purpose of commemorating a triumph yet greater and more valuable than yours, because it will be a triumph final and complete. I cannot doubt that the time is not very far distant when we shall meet here to celebrate that great triumph which has so frequently been alluded to this evening, and which, I am quite sure, will be hailed with a zeal and enthusiasm that will prove how much value we set upon it; more especially, as leading to the ultimate abrogation of all tests of all classes, by whatever name they may be called—to whatever part of the empire they may belong, and by whatever rites they may worship the Deity [loud applause]. When at length that time shall arrive, no doubt it will be hailed with delight by you, as it will be by rapture with me, looking at what has emanated from a Noble Lord (Holland), whom I cannot but view as the representative of us Foxites. This triumph of to-day is the restoration of the rights of the Constitution to a great part of the community, which has long been excluded from them; for to-day we may found our first approach to that consummation, which I trust our rulers will not

interfere to prevent; but which, if it must be effected without their means, will, I hope, experience sufficient support from our own means; that we may receive their aid, I am sure we shall all most cordially desire; but if we cannot obtain it, why then let us do it in spite of them —let us do it in spite of 'those who believe any thing, vote for every thing, and subscribe to every thing.' I trust, however, as they have not lately opposed us with their former vigour, they will not again do so; and this, at least, I know, that the more firm we show ourselves, the less will they oppose us, till at length, in one way or another, we shall find ourselves able to celebrate the Restoration of the Constitution, which is the birthright of the people; not merely to any particular class of persons, however large, however important, or however respectable that class may be—but to the whole united people of England, Scotland, and Ireland."—[Enthusiastic cheering.]

On Thursday, May 29, was held at Rawtonstall, Lancashire, the Annual Meeting of the Methodist Unitarians of the district. Mr. Stewart of Todmorden preached in the morning, from Hebrews vi. 12. At the conclusion of the service, nearly 100 of the friends and members dined together. In the afternoon, about 300 persons assembled in the Chapel, to transact the business of the Association; Mr. Wilkinson of Rochdale in the chair. Mr. John Ashworth of Newchurch, Rossendale, stated, that the congregation in that place was in a more flourishing condition than it had at any time been since its formation. The Sunday schools were also prospering. Mr. Taylor reported the state of the Methodist Unitarian Society in Rochdale, to be much as formerly, steadily increasing. Next arose a venerable man, upwards of seventy years of age, to report for the village in which the Association was held. Mr. Ingham some years since had been a decided Antinomian, but on further examination, had, even at his advanced age, changed his views for those of Unitarian Christianity. It was truly delightful to witness the fervency with which he spoke of the doctrines of piety and righteousness, which he now cherishes and professes. The congregation, he stated, was not numerous, but zealously alive to the general interests of Christian truth; and, particularly, to the success of the Sunday school, established in connection with the Society. Mr. John Robinson gave a pleasing account of the Padiham congregation. This Society was never in so prosperous a state as at present. The Sunday school had succeeded beyond their warmest anticipations. Not only the young, but many adults flocked to it for instruction; and the only regret the congregation felt, was, that, for want of books, they could not answer the demands made upon them for religious information. At Downham, Rimington, and Burnley, there is also a great desire to inquire after religious truth. Could a missionary be stationed in this district, there can be no question that greatly beneficial results would ensue. The remark of Mr. Robinson, that the Sunday-school stood in need of pecuniary assistance, gave occasion to the gratifying display of the truly Christian feeling, which exists between the different societies of the district. The friends at Rawtonstall, though

themselves in humble circumstances, directly raised a collection of more than two pounds for the brethren at Padiham. Mr. Wilkinson next stated, that a vigorous effort had been made at Oldham, to revive the interests of our common cause; and so successful had it been, that not less than forty sittings had, within the last few months, been taken in the chapel. The next Association was appointed to be held at Newchurch, Mr. Tate of Charles, and Mr. Davis of Chowbent, being requested to preach. The meeting then concluded, as it had commenced, with singing and prayer. In the evening an interesting discourse was delivered by the Rev. J. Ragland of Hindley.

On Monday evening, the 2d June, a general Meeting of the Subscribers and friends to the Fellowship Fund, in connection with the Unitarian Congregation, Sheffield, was held in the Chapel. After Mr. Harris had commenced the meeting by singing and prayer, T. A. Ward, Esq. the Town's Regent, was appointed chairman. The following Report was read by Mr. Palfreyman, the Secretary. Various resolutions were moved—by Messrs. Wright of Stannington, Brettell of Rotherham, and Harris of Glasgow; and the meeting concluded with singing and prayer. We were glad to see this meeting. It was attended by many persons of other denominations. It is highly to the honour of our Sheffield friends, thus to have led the way in exciting public attention to the proceedings and progress of Unitarianism. This field of exertion, we have too long allowed those who oppose and deprecate our principles, wholly to occupy. We need not wonder, that the public mind should be impressed against us and our opinions, whilst we suffer the public ear, only to listen to denunciations of our faith, and condemnations of our indifference and supineness. Would we have the pure gospel of the Saviour to bless the hearts and improve the minds of our fellow-creatures, we must show that we are ourselves in earnest. We must prove, that we are anxious that others should embrace the faith we profess, by manifesting in our actions its sanctifying and benevolent influences.

"The Committee of the Sheffield Fellowship Fund, in reporting to the Members the state of the Institution committed to their care, have great pleasure in announcing, that the increased support which they obtained from the Congregation at the close of the year 1826, continues; and although no great addition has been made to the number of the members since the last annual meeting, the funds of the Society are greater than those of the preceding year. The amount collected and to collect is £34 : 15 : 0, the number of members 132. Donations have been given from this amount, to the chapels at Preston, Glasgow, St. Cleat's, and Northampton, and also to the Unitarian Association. Notwithstanding the publicity given on a previous occasion to the plan and objects of Fellowship Funds, your Committee think that it will not be improper on the present occasion, to again call the attention of the members and of the friends of the Institution, to

a brief sketch of the rise, progress, and intent of these associations, the establishment of which, forms an era in the history of English Unitarianism; and they trust that this deviation from the usual plan of reporting a mere formal detail of their Stewardship, will not be unacceptable. In the year 1816, the late Dr. Thomson of Halifax, and afterwards of Leeds, first drew the attention of the Unitarian public, through the medium of the Monthly Repository, to the advantages, both as regarded policy, temporal and religious, which the union of efforts was calculated to create; he appealed to the experience which other sects had afforded, of the efficacy of the contribution of numbers, at stated times, and in proportions differing according to their ability, towards the attainment of some common object; and pointed out the peculiar advantages arising from such institutions, as Unitarians were not united in any ecclesiastical discipline; and as the diffusion of their doctrines among the humbler classes of their countrymen, had brought forward many cases in which persons were desirous of joining together in the profession and worship of the one God the Father, after the example and according to the command of the Christian Lawgiver, but were prevented from carrying their pious desires into effect, by the want of means. The amiable originator had other views, besides a mere accumulation of strength, in advocating these institutions; he foretold the benefits which would arise from bringing the different members of each Society into a Christian fellowship with each other; in creating a personal as well as a congregational friendship amongst the respective parts of the different bodies. It would be a delightful task to trace the gradual developement of the embryo system in the mind of its inventor—to follow, step by step, the arguments as they presented themselves to his imagination from his first mentioning the plan at a meeting in Elland in this County, in the year 1815, to the recommending these institutions to the acceptance of his fellow-religionists—but that task cannot now be attempted. Imagination can only supply the place of facts—for that mind was soon removed from its earthly clothing, that amiable spirit which when on earth seemed superior to its station, was soon removed to dwell with kindred spirits in another and a better state; before he could see the glorious fruits which have sprung up and flourished from the seed he sowed, death summoned him away, and, in his removal, has cast a hallowed atmosphere around these the effects of his dying labours. Some of the views which he entertained in connection with these institutions, and the nature of the incentives which spurred him on to the development of his plans, are preserved in the paper which he published in the Monthly Repository for October 1816; and in the following remarks of the late Rev. H. Turner of Nottingham, his friend on earth, and now no doubt his friend in heaven—

> 'For there congenial minds, array'd in light,
> High thoughts shall interchange,
> Nor cease, with ever new delight,
> On wings of love to range.'

'It may be allowed one,' says Mr. Turner, 'who had the happiness of being intimately acquainted with the late Dr. Thomson, to describe the views which he entertained on this subject. He was of opinion, that the Unitarians were far from doing justice to their own cause. The opposition they had experienced from without, had not been compensated by any closer union amongst themselves. The scattered members of their body were left to struggle as they could, with the difficulties and discouragements arising from an unpopular persuasion, and were scarcely made conscious that there existed any who partook of the same religious sentiments, and were actuated by the same conviction as themselves. Unitarians, he thought, had called in the aid of so few of the natural and usual means of success, that had it not been for the intrinsic strength of their cause, it must soon have become extinct. He observed, with great satisfaction, the progress of Unitarianism among the lower classes, and regarded it as an important test of the truth and solidity of its principles; for he was accustomed to say, that a religion which did not meet the wants of the poor, ought to be rejected by all. He was rejoiced to find Unitarian principles as suitable to the cottage of the poor, as to the closet of the learned. In this state of things, he perceived that a greater union had become in our Societies absolutely necessary.' But the following passage from Dr. Thomson's own paper, respecting Fellowship Funds, will throw the most direct light on his own views:—'The calls upon Unitarian liberality, for the erection of new chapels, and other important objects, have of late happily been frequent. But if continued, which I trust will be the case, they cannot be so promptly met and so effectually answered as they ought to be. The willing giver, from prudential motives, will be obliged, however reluctantly, to withhold his aid. We must, therefore, look out for other and multiplied sources of supply, and call in the many in aid of the few. Before you,' said the amiable author, 'is a plan for that purpose, which, whilst it originates a fresh set of contributors, and falls so easily upon all as not to be felt by any, does not interfere with, nor supersede the exercise of liberality on the part of the affluent members of the Unitarian body.' The spirited appeal thus made, was speedily answered, and the Unitarian congregations were surprised at their mental lethargy, in not having sooner discovered and adopted a plan, so simple in its constitution, so powerful in its effects. The details of Dr. Thomson's plan were nearly similar to those adopted by this and every other institution bearing the name of Fellowship Funds; the peculiar objects of each Society, its management and internal regulations, differing or agreeing with each other according to the will of the respective congregations. The congregation of the new meeting at Birmingham, claim the palm of having first carried into operation Dr. Thomson's suggestions. The elder members of the congregation thought the small subscription too trifling and too troublesome to engage their attention; but the younger members, attracted by the simplicity of the plan, engaged with the zeal peculiar to their age, in reducing

it to practice. Their active exertions soon rendered the Institution of importance, and within a very short time after the publication of Dr. Thomson's letter, the Birmingham Society came into full operation, and has since continued of great service to the cause it was formed to support. The seniors soon lent their aid to the juniors, but, with a Christian feeling, have ever since yielded to the youthful originators the principal management of the Institution. In the first year, they enrolled 226 members; it was this Society that first seconded the exertions of Dr. Thomson, by publishing in the Christian Reformer, an account of its own origin, and a statement of its usefulness; thus holding out an inducement to other congregations to follow its example. The old Meeting-house at Birmingham speedily followed its neighbours in this work of love, and it is with pride your Committee are able to state, that Sheffield was not backward in lending its aid in promoting this desirable measure. In the year 1817, a Fellowship Fund was established in connection with this congregation, which, although for a time it was in a state of comparative inefficiency, has now given, and is giving ample proofs of the immensity of the good which such institutions are calculated to accomplish. Liverpool, York, Lincoln, Chesterfield, and many other places, caught the pious enthusiasm, and joined their efforts to support their various Institutions, scattering good around them, and proving the truth of the poet's attribute of mercy: that 'it is twice blessed —it blesseth him that gives, and them that receive.'

"Various additions have been made by different Societies to the original plan of Dr. Thomson, in pursuance of his ardent wish, that the friends of Unitarianism would improve upon his suggestion. In 1818, the Fellowship Fund at Lincoln, then under the care of that indefatigable minister, Mr. Hawkes, joined to the other objects of the fund, a plan of circulating books and pamphlets connected with Unitarianism, amongst its members; and also connecting with it meetings for religious discussion, and exercises similar in effect to those which this Society has adopted. The Fellowship Fund at York also embraced amongst its objects, at an early period of its existence, the formation of a Vestry Library. The one at Cirencester, which was established under the management of a late townsman, Mr. T. Horsfield, also added to its other objects, the purchase and circulation of books; and the Gravel-Pit Meeting at Hackney, agreeably as they state in their Report for the year 1820, to another of the express objects of Fellowship Funds, provided books and pamphlets for the use of the members of the congregation in humble life; and they express a hope that their successors in office will keep that object in view. And their successors obeyed that injunction, and in their Report for the following year, spoke in high terms of the benefit which had been derived from this department of their institution. The Fellowship Fund at Taunton, has carried their plan of circulating tracts to a great extent, and the Committee, in connection with this distribution, also hold meetings for religious conversation. This mode of appropriating a small part of the Funds, appears to

THE

CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

No. 24. AUGUST, 1828. Vol. II.

The World, a State of Probation.

(Continued from page 384.)

REVELATION teaches us, that this life is a state of trial, by which we are to become prepared for the enjoyment of happiness in another and future state of existence. And we certainly find it to be admirably fitted for the purpose: pain and evil, as they are termed, (but which the Christian believes to be salutary chastisements from the hand of God,) being indispensable agents in the scheme; and the faculties with which man is endowed, being eminently adapted to his situation. Far, therefore, from allowing, that the world is a mere mass of chaotic disorder—the ruins of that beauteous creation which God originally formed, we are justified in believing, that the will of the Deity has never changed—that every thing, as it exists, is in perfect accordance with his immutable appointment—and was, from the beginning, decreed for the wisest and best purposes.

It is the dictate of reason, and taught by revelation, that the world is a state of probation; and we cannot believe, consistently with the attributes of God, that he ever intended it for any thing else—that his purposes could be turned aside, his will opposed, or his intentions thwarted, by insurmountable obstacles—that he was obliged to alter his plans, and modify his operations, according to contingencies, arising from the actions of a finite being. Could the transgression of Adam, disarrange the anterior views of God with respect to creation, and cause him to pursue a different method from that which he intended prior to the fall? Did that event produce a metamorphosis in the nature of the first man, so that, from being in the image of God, virtuous and immortal, he became a lump and seed of sin?—that the whole of creation fell with him?—its order and harmony, its beauty and loveliness destroyed?—that the plans of omnipotent wisdom were overturned, and his universe menaced with universal ruin? Neither nature

nor revelation afford data, from which to deduce such conclusions. The fall of Adam was not physical, but moral, from a state of innocence to one of guilt; and the effects produced by it, must be in unison with the cause. Man, as he at present exists, is the same kind of being with that which sprang from the dust of the earth, at the bidding of the Creator; he has the same powers to call into action, and the same theatre for their exercise. His nature is not changed, his constitution is essentially the same as was that of Adam. This would be at once evident, if the account of the creation, and of the fall of man, recorded in the Sacred Volume, was considered worthy of credence; but it is lamentable to reflect, that the reveries of a gloomy monk*—whose morbid exacerbation was rendered tenfold more intense, by the superstitious austerities to which he subjected himself—should be preferred to that holy revelation, which beams with the radiance of divine benevolence, which delineates our God as delighting in mercy and love, and as viewing with pity and compassion, the follies and transgressions of his creatures.

The account of the creation, &c. by Moses, must, from the pictorial or ideographic mode of writing in use in the earliest ages, and which constituted, it may be inferred, the medium through which he obtained his information, be received with caution as a *literal* narrative. But this does not influence the conclusion to be drawn from it; whether it was the eating of an apple, or some other offence, figured under that similitude, which Adam committed: it is sufficient for us to believe, that he transgressed. But the overwhelming consequences, which are said to result from this trangression, are not so obvious. It is not evident, that Adam was an immortal being, (it being a favourite assumption to suppose him so created,) lost his immortality on account of sin, and was then doomed to destruction, and his nature changed. In the instructions given to Adam for the government of his conduct, we find the denunciation, with respect to "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—Thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die,"

* The morose bigot *Austin*, a Romish *Saint*, the inventor of the doctrine of original sin and innate depravity, was, as an Ebionite, somewhat tinctured with heresy; but he established his orthodoxy by becoming a Trinitarian, although he founded that doctrine on the *triad* which Plato borrowed from the Egyptian mythology.

(Gen. ii. 17.) or, as it is sometimes rendered, "dying, thou shalt die." This will not admit of a literal interpretation, because physical death did not occur on the day when he partook of the forbidden fruit: in a moral sense, it may be with propriety asserted, that he died as to a state of innocence; but this moral death is very different from the death, corporeal, spiritual, and eternal, which orthodoxy defines to be the punishment of his crime. If the passage be rendered, "dying, thou shalt die," it implies, that had Adam retained his innocence, he might have been saved from death by the interposition of divine power, but which, in consequence of transgression, was not vouchsafed: constituted liable to death, he must submit to the operation of natural causes, and when his frame and strength decayed, must die—dying, thou *shalt* die. After his disobedience, it was revealed to him, that he was a creature of the dust, and that, as a natural consequence of his formation, he would again mingle with his kindred element; his punishment was, that he must furnish himself with sustenance, by labour and industry, until the close of life. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; *for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*"—(Gen. iii. 19.) Here is no foundation for the notion, that our common father was immortal; the language implies, that Adam was created mortal, and liable to death,* an opinion corroborated by the following passage: "And the Lord God said, behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, *and eat, and live for ever*; therefore, the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was

* Some infer that he was immortal, because God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—(Gen. ii. 7.) But no argument can be founded on the word *soul*, literally breath; the term, in the original, being used in various senses. Man became possessed of vitality—a living being. The Rev. David Thom, of Liverpool, thus analyzes the verse: "1. God formed the body of Adam. The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground. 2. God conferred life on this body, by enabling it to breathe. And breathed into its nostrils the breath of life. 3. In consequence of this, that which had formerly been an inanimate lump or mass, became a creature endowed with a principle of life; evinced by, and connected with, breathing. And man became a living soul, or a living breathing creature. In the whole process, I can discover from the text itself, nothing more than this."—*Three Questions proposed and answered, &c.*"

taken."—(Gen. iii. 22, 23.) Now, if Adam possessed inherent immortality, what purpose would have been answered by debarring his access to the "tree of life?" or how would the effect have been accomplished which Moses assigns as the reason of his banishment, *viz.* as a measure of precaution to prevent his tasting thereof, because, had he done so, he would live for ever?

Adam, therefore, it appears, was created a mortal being, and this is an opinion in perfect unison with the apparent designs of providence. We are sensible of the production of an endless succession of rational and accountable beings, who, by the right use of their powers, are able to acquire happiness, and who, according to their conduct individually, are promised eternal felicity, or corrective punishment. Death seems to be an indispensable adjunct in the scheme of the creation of man. His time of probation must necessarily be limited—its extent be specified and defined. This is done by death. The earth is not boundless space, and cannot produce infinite subsistence for the support of animal life. Hence, either the numbers of our species must be circumscribed within a narrow circle, which would equally circumscribe the quantity of enjoyment, or some method be selected by which to dispose of the redundancy. Death is the wise provision which God has appointed for this purpose. We cannot, therefore, believe, that he originally intended the earth to be the abode of sinless and immortal beings, possessed of appetites and passions, and necessarily obliged to satisfy the cravings and desires of nature. Nor can we believe, that his intention was rendered abortive by the transgression of Adam—who introduced both good and evil into the world, and even death—contrary to his behest. It cannot be doubted that creation must exist, according to the original unwavering intention of the great Creator. Omnipotence cannot be thwarted in his purposes, by the wayward actions of the creature which he fashioned, and Prescience could not be ignorant of what that creature would actually perform. And hence, it follows, that Adam was mortal, and liable to that death which was instituted for wise and salutary purposes.

It is recorded, that Adam received a command from the Almighty: this imposes an obligatory duty; hence, we infer the possession of powers enabling him to perform it; but for the efficient exercise of these powers, it

is necessary that their use be unconstrained, which constitutes him a free agent, and being, therefore, able either to keep or to break God's command, it results that he was peccable. He fell from a state of innocence; his eyes were then opened to know good and evil; he experienced, and therefore perceived, the difference between vice and virtue; and being capable of making his selection, he was an accountable agent, and amenable to punishment. This appears to have been the original conformation of Adam, as it is that of his descendants. His Creator surely knew what consequences would result from the use of those powers with which he was endowed; and be it remembered, Omnipotence pronounced him *good!*

Nor is any adventitious cause required, from whence to derive the origin of sin. Adam, surely, as immediately proceeding from the hands of a holy God, had not a nature prone to wickedness—the sole desire of whose heart, was to do evil continually. The era when hereditary depravity was discovered, was long afterwards; *he* sinned without the agency of this moral taint, and his descendants do so likewise. By him, indeed, sin first entered into the world, and death by sin; had he remained spotless, he might, possibly, have been translated to another state, without tasting death, and so also might his posterity, if they had retained their innocence; but now death has passed upon all men, not because Adam transgressed, but because ALL have sinned.

Generally received as is the doctrine of man's fallen nature, Christianity does not sanction it, nor countenance a system which delights to vilify our species, to heap scorn and contumely upon the noblest work of God, and recklessly to libel that creation which he pronounced *good.* On the contrary, it recognises mankind as intellectual and competent agents, and is addressed to them as able to comply with its requisitions. Jesus and his apostles constantly taught their hearers to reduce their precepts to practice; they could not, therefore, be incapable of so doing. The prophet of Nazareth and his Evangelists, never allude to what is technically called birth-sin—to the tainted nature of the human race; they describe sin as an individual action which might have been avoided, and that man's duty consists in keeping the commandments; but if we suppose performance to be an impossibility, on account of natural incapacity, were they not

guilty of a cruel mockery, on the most solemn and momentous subject which can engage the attention of mankind.

The fact is, the simple but divine truths of Jesus, own no fellowship with those commandments of men, falsely taught as Christian doctrines. They have no connection with those orthodox points now deemed essential to salvation, and which, founded on the monkish dream of man's fallen nature, outrage the dictates of common sense, oppose the doctrines of revelation, are inconsistent with the attributes of God, and form a mass of incoherent absurdity. When the simplicity of the gospel is forsaken for the interminable labyrinths of error, the folly of human presumption is strikingly displayed. Many are the blind leaders of the blind, making the commandments of God of non-effect, through their vain traditions. D.

To the Editor of the Christian Pioneer.

SIR,

ALLOW me, through the medium of your useful Periodical, to congratulate the friends of free inquiry, that our Scottish Champion of refined Calvinism, Dr. Wardlaw, has at length, after twelve years "hesitation," ventured to notice Mr. Yates's call upon him, "as a man of honour and integrity, to *correct* his *mis*-statements," or, of course, substantiate his allegations. This, however, the Doctor has done, not in an avowed and regular reply to Mr. Yates's "Sequel to his Vindication of Unitarianism," for "the Doctor is *sick* of debate"—(and no marvel, the winding-up "debate" given in the "Sequel," in the very words of the debaters, might have entered the sensorium of any mass-gulping Papist, and made even him "sick" of continuing to worship a Wafer and play the cannibal with his God)—but incidentally, as it were, in a new edition of his "Discourses on the Principal Points of the Socinian Controversy:" in the Preface peculiar to which (for the volume has two Prefaces and a Prefatory Advertisement), "the Doctor flatters himself" that he has succeeded in "transfusing with advantage into the text and notes of the Discourses, some portions of his Reply to Mr. Yates;" which latter volume, it appears "he has no intention of republishing" under the title of "Unitarianism *In*capable of Vindication!"

Let me, by the way, in justice to the Doctor, remind his readers, that the said *quondam* title, was adopted before he became nigh unto literary death "*sick* of debate." Unitarians especially, as "generous disputants," can have no objections to allow the Doctor to sink the *misnomer*, and quietly to allow it to become as obsolete as the divinity of "the great goddess *Diana* and of the *Image* which fell down from *Jupiter:*"—which celestial hypostasis (I am not sure of the spelling of this word, as I have not a Confession of Faith at hand), being united in one sentence, might, for aught I know, be orthodoxly quoted to establish "*the* truth" that the Ephesians were Trinitarians! It is evident, that their Lord Chancellor, the Town-Clerk, held the legal opinion, that the said compendium of orthodoxy, was "part and parcel of the law of the land," or he would not, in his official capacity, have given the people credit for knowing the fact, "that these things are so, and cannot be spoken against!" To which "things" the pious Demetrius also zealously bore his testimony, only (like some of our modern declaimers) using his discretion, he chose to single out and defend the "hypostasis" to which he naturally felt most attached and grateful; and being, like the Doctor, "sick of debate," and "having no feeling towards the system" advocated by Paul, "but that of serious and settled abhorrence," and having also, like the Doctor, an unconquerable aversion to "empty pews and echoing walls," which could yield but a meagre supply of "the *root* of all evil"—a *root* the very "antipodes" of arrow-root, from the baneful effects of a superabundance of which, the Shepherds of old, were, doubtless, like our own soul-saving Shepherds, most anxious to relieve their flocks,—the learned Demetrius, in his generation, did, as the wise in our generation take credit to themselves for doing, he kept dutifully in the stream of theological fashion, and merited the applause of the populace, by defending the "hypostasis" "whom all Asia and the world worshipped," and who, of course, not in "empty pews and echoing walls," re-echoed "*the* truth"—the profitable truth—"saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians! —Great is the goddess Diana!" As a matter of literary curiosity, it is a pity that no historian has informed us, if these two "defenders of the [Ephesian] faith," were the first who were honoured by being allowed to affix the initial of Diana's name "double" to their own!—D.D. with

threefold unity, might have symbolised the fact, that Demetrius and the Town-Clerk, as Disciples of Diana, believed in the Divinity of Diana, and were learned in the mystery of her Double Descent! Indeed, to this day, there remains as distinct testimony to her humanity as to her divinity, and, of necessity, to her "double nature," for we read that she took an interest in fox-hunting on earth, which she could not have done had she not been a partaker of humanity! But, *sic transit gloria mundi*, that our modern authorities have given to D. D. quite another rendering, and so metamorphosed the consecrated letters, as to make them mean an ambassador of the dual "distinction," who has qualified himself, by studying the amours, and intrigues, and transformations, and wars, of the Roman and Grecian Divinities, to be a "Doctor of Divinity!"

But to give up this parabolical digression,—which, if persisted in, might prove a stumbling-block of offence, and be construed by persons weak in the faith, into irreverence, although I might adduce the example of an eminent Prophet as exculpatory evidence, that although "double" debating is despicable, yet, that an occasional sprinkling of "double entendre," is sometimes the only species of argument which some logic merits,—I shall conclude my notice, by leaving it to Mr. Yates, to examine and estimate the value of this last and elaborate attempt by Dr. Wardlaw, to get out of a "debate," there is reason to think he has, oftener than once, wished he had never got into. Whether or not Mr. Yates, when he peruses the volume, with its corrections and additions, will be of opinion, that his old "friend" has progressed in "a kind of management and generalship which a votary of truth would scorn," I shall not presume to say; but I have no doubt, that, if it shall be found that the Doctor has really made advances in candour and Christian charity, and succeeded in rendering a better reason for still holding fast his "double" view, and persevering in the use of his unpatent padlock "key," than that assigned by the Poet, to a certain class of doughty disputants,—

> "A man convinced against his will,
> Is of the same opinion still,"—

the edifying fact, will be promptly, and without twelve years "hesitation," acknowledged by Mr. Yates, and also perhaps by some of those other living authors, whose names

the Doctor has honoured with a niche in this new volume of "Prefaces, Sermons, Concluding General Reflections, and Notes."

Before concluding, however, I must be permitted briefly to say, that the Doctor's polemical lucubrations, appear to savour so strongly of the Pharisaical leaven, that even his humility seems inflated with that spiritual pride, which condescendingly looks on those who see not with *his* eyes, and hear not with *his* ears, only to awe them to a greater distance—his very complacency breathing, "Stand by, for *I* am holier than thou—*I* have *a diploma* certifying the orthodoxy of all my oracular responses—*I*, indeed, make no Popish pretensions to infallibility, but *I* have the full assurance of faith that I am divinely illuminated, and cannot be mistaken, yea, the views *I* entertain, were to me early 'imparted with tender solicitude by an affectionate and pious father!'" All this may be very well with the Doctor, and be conclusive evidence of the moral effects of Trinitarianism, so far as he is personally concerned; but what availeth his bewailing invectives against the moral tendency of Unitarianism, because, forsooth, some pious eavesdropper has been permitted to whisper a "report" in his ear, that he has never heard Unitarians praying aloud in the corners of the streets, to be witnessed by men—that Unitarians are not known to be constantly filled with holy solicitude, lest the Judge of all the earth should *forget* to do right——that Unitarians are not sufficiently alive to the necessity of incessantly reminding the Father of all the families that dwell on the face of the earth, that since his justice has been satisfied [satiated or revenged*] by the death of one of his equals, he *may* honourably take compassion on his own children, created in his own image, to whom he hath given life, and breath, and all things! Really, on reading

* This is the Calvinism of the last century—Dr. Wardlaw, in "his approximation to the Unitarians," has *refined* upon this "essential," we must not say, for the *double* purpose of confounding anti-calvinists and concealing from curious gaze "the essence of Christianity"—that essence, which a celebrated author in the ranks of orthodoxy, declares, "stands in the Bible" so "plain," that "he never knew any person [he is well acquainted with Dr. Wardlaw] attempt to make it more plain, without throwing a mist and a darkness about it, more calculated to bewilder than to guide the path of a sincere inquirer after truth." But, for a specimen of the most modern method of discoursing eloquently on the subject, without making "it more plain," we must refer to the volume itself, as any "attempt" of ours to annex "any clear conception" to "*the* truth," would be ycleped "a hideous caricature."—*Ed. pro tem.*

the Doctor's long list of inquisitorial interrogatories, which, by implication, modestly assumes it to be a fact, that of all the virtues which constitute the excellence of moral character, Unitarians are utterly destitute,—*ergo*, Trinitarians, being professors of "the antipodes" of Unitarianism, must be the salt of the earth and the favourites of heaven,—one cannot help admiring his adroitness in breaking his fall. But, had the Doctor had any confidence, that his arguments were powerful to the pulling down of the strong-holds of Unitarianism, it is not at all likely that he would as a last resource, have stooped, as he has done in his "Concluding General Reflections," to invidious insinuations against the moral characters of the "converts to Unitarianism." But, even on this ground, would it advantage Trinitarianism, were a comparison of character to be made the test of truth? The Doctor is too experienced in "manœuvring," to attempt to prove, that had the entire population of our extensive city, been regularly baptised in the name of the Trinity, and remained proof against the "seductive plausibilities of Unitarianism," those capacious and over-crowded public edifices, our Police-Offices, our Jail, and our Bridewell, would either not have been built or never been tenanted! —That the "Golden Rule" and the "Law of Love," would long ere now have rendered useless our voluminous civil and criminal statutes, which have been found necessary to restrain injustice and vice!—That drunkenness, and profanity, and falsehood, and covetousness, and double dealing, and slander, and malice, and the long catalogue of more tangible crimes, which even the punishments of banishment and death are inadequate to prevent, would have been unheard of? I am aware, that the Doctor, were he to deign to notice these questions, would indignantly repel them from himself and his "fellow-Christians," by unceremoniously handing the Trinitarians, *en masse*, who practise these things, to the communion of our national ecclesiastical establishment and her dissenting auxiliaries! But if Trinitarianism be so very superior to Unitarianism, in its moral effects, why is its influence to be confined to the comparatively insignificant number who worship in the inner court of Dr. Wardlaw's temple? Is it quite certain that even the Doctor's select flock are all Nathaniels, and that none of his respectable congregation are unbelievers in his "essential" conceits? Before the Doctor

replies in the affirmative, it may be prudent for him, to lend his other ear to "report," and lower a little the shrilness of his clarion, in proclaiming the proximity of Mr. Tayler's [of Manchester] creed to the natural theology of Deism.

I have extended my notice beyond my intention when I took up my pen; but, while leaving the Doctor's arguments to be appreciated by those who are better qualified for doing him justice, I have been unable to resist the temptation, of showing my sense of his liberality, (even at the risk of "defilement with touching his obloquy," a task which it is not likely Mr. Yates or any of those others he has condescended to name, would demean themselves to perform,) by handing him back "some portions" of his own, with most respectful compliments, and to suggest, that it may be expedient for his own comfort, that he restrain his generosity.

I am, Sir,

A "Convert from Trinitarianism."

Additional Remarks on the Character of Napoleon Bonaparte, by Dr. Channing of Boston, North America.

In former numbers of our work, we reviewed the life and character of Napoleon Bonaparte. We resume the subject, not for the purpose of speaking more largely of the individual, but that we may consider more distinctly the *principle of action* which governed him, and of which he was a remarkable manifestation.

The passion for power was Bonaparte's ruling principle. Power was his idol. He worshipped no other. To gain supremacy and unlimited sway, to subject men to his will, was his chief, settled, unrelenting purpose. This passion drew and converted into itself the whole energy of his nature. The love of power, that common principle, explains, in a great degree, his character and life. His crimes did not spring from any passion or impulse peculiar to himself. With all his contempt of the human race, he still belonged to it. It is true both of the brightest virtues and the blackest vices, though they seem to set apart their possessors from the rest of mankind, that the seeds of them are sown in every human breast. The man who attracts and awes us by his intellectual and moral grandeur, is only an example and anticipation of the improvements, for which every mind was endowed with reason and conscience; and the worst man has become such by the perversion and excess of desires and appetites which he shares with his whole race. Napoleon had no element of character which others do not possess. It was his misery and guilt that he was usurped and absorbed by one passion; that his whole mind shot

up into one growth; that his singular strength of thought and will, which, if consecrated to virtue, would have enrolled him among the benefactors of mankind, was enslaved by one lust. He is not to be gazed on as a prodigy. He was a manifestation of our own nature. He teaches, on a large scale, what thousands teach on a narrower one. He shows us the greatness of the ruin, which is wrought when the order of the mind is subverted, conscience dethroned, and a strong passion left without restraint to turn every inward and outward resource to the accomplishment of a selfish purpose.

The influence of the *love of power* on human affairs, is so constant, unbounded, and tremendous, that we think this principle of our nature worthy of distinct consideration, and shall devote to it a few pages, as a fit sequel to our notice of Bonaparte.

The passion for power is one of the most universal, nor is it to be regarded as a crime in all its forms. Sweeping censures on a natural sentiment, cast blame on the Creator. This principle shows itself in the very dawn of our existence. The child never exults and rejoices more, than when it becomes conscious of power by overcoming difficulties, or compassing new ends. All our desires and appetites lend aid and energy to this passion, for all find increase of gratification, in proportion to our increase of power. We ought to add, that this principle is fed from nobler sources. Power is a chief element of all the commanding qualities of our nature. It enters into all the higher virtues; such as magnanimity, fortitude, constancy. It enters into intellectual eminence. It is power of thought and utterance which immortalizes the products of genius. Is it strange that an attribute, through which all our passions reach their objects, and which characterises whatever is great or admirable in man, should awaken intense desire, and be sought as one of the chief goods of life?

The love of power, we have said, is not in all its forms a crime. There are indeed, various kinds of power, which it is our duty to covet, accumulate, and hold fast. First, there is *inward* power, the most precious of all possessions; power over ourselves; power to withstand trial, to bear suffering, to front danger; power over pleasure and pain; power to follow our convictions, however resisted by menace or scorn; the power of calm reliance in seasons of darkness and storms. Again, there is a power over *outward* things; the power by which the mind triumphs over matter, presses into its service the subtlest and strongest elements, makes the winds, fire, and steam its ministers, rears the city, opens a path through the ocean, and makes the wilderness blossom as the rose. These forms of power, especially the first, are glorious distinctions of our race, nor can we prize them too highly.

There is another power, which is our principal concern in the present discussion. We mean, power over our fellow-creatures. It is this which ambition chiefly covets, and which has instigated to more crime, and spread more misery, than any other cause. We are not, however, to condemn even this universally. There is a truly noble sway of man over man; one, which it is our honour to seek and exert; which is earned by well-doing; which

is a chief recompense of virtue. We refer to the quickening influence of a good and great mind over other minds, by which it brings them into sympathy with itself. Far from condemning this, we are anxious to hold it forth as the purest glory which virtuous ambition can propose. The power of awakening, enlightening, elevating our fellow-creatures, may, with peculiar fitness, be called divine; for there is no agency of God so beneficent and sublime, as that which he exerts on rational natures, and by which he assimilates them to himself. This quickening power over other minds is the surest test of greatness. We admire indeed the energy, which subdues the material creation, or developes the physical resources of a state. But it is a nobler might which calls forth the intellectual and moral resources of a people, which communicates new impulses to society, throws into circulation new and stirring thoughts, gives the mind a new consciousness of its faculties, and rouses and fortifies the will to an unconquerable purpose of well-doing. This spiritual power is worth all other. To improve man's outward condition is a secondary agency, and is chiefly important as it gives the means of inward growth. The most glorious minister of God on earth, is he who speaks with a life giving energy to other minds, breathing into them the love of truth and virtue, strengthening them to suffer in a good cause, and lifting them above the senses and the world.

We know not a more exhilarating thought, than that this power is given to men; that we can not only change the face of the outward world, and by virtuous discipline improve ourselves, but that we may become springs of life and light to our fellow beings. We are thus admitted to a fellowship with Jesus Christ, whose highest end was, that he might act with a new and celestial energy on the human mind. We rejoice to think, that he did not come to monopolize this divine sway, to enjoy a solitary grandeur, but to receive others, even all who should obey his religion, into the partnership of this honour and happiness. Every Christian, in proportion to his progress, acquires a measure of this divine agency. In the humblest conditions, a power goes forth from a devout and disinterested spirit, calling forth, silently, moral and religious sentiment, perhaps in a child, or some other friend, and teaching, without the aid of words, the loveliness and peace of sincere and single-hearted virtue. In the more enlightened classes, individuals now and then rise up, who, through a singular force and elevation of soul, obtain a sway over men's minds to which no limit can be prescribed. They speak with a voice which is heard by distant nations, and which goes down to future ages. Their names are repeated with veneration by millions, and millions read in their lives and writings a quickening testimony to the greatness of the mind, to its moral strength, to the reality of disinterested virtue. These are the true sovereigns of the earth. They share in the royalty of Jesus Christ. They have a greatness which will be more and more felt. The time is coming, its signs are visible, when this long mistaken attribute of greatness, will be seen to belong eminently, if not exclusively, to those, who,

by their characters, deeds, sufferings, writings, leave imperishable and ennobling traces of themselves on the human mind. Among these legitimate sovereigns of the world, will be ranked the Philosopher, who penetrates the secrets of the universe, and opens new fields to the intellect; who spreads enlarged and liberal habits of thought, and who helps men to understand, that an ever-growing knowledge is the patrimony destined for them by the 'Father o their spirits.' Among them will be ranked the Statesman, who, escaping a vulgar policy, rises to the discovery of the true interest of a state; who understands that a nation's mind is more valuable than its soil; who inspirits a people's enterprise, without making them the slaves of wealth; who looks for his glory to posterity, and is mainly anxious to originate or give stability to institutions by which society may be carried forward. Among these will be ranked, perhaps on the highest throne, the moral and religious Reformer, who truly merits that name; who rises above the spirit of his times; who is moved by a holy impulse to assail vicious establishments, sustained by fierce passions and inveterate prejudices; who rescues great truths from the corruptions of ages; who, joining calm and deep thought to profound feeling, secures to religion at once enlightened and earnest conviction; who unfolds to men higher forms of virtue than they have yet attained or conceived; who gives brighter and more thrilling views of the perfection for which they were framed, and inspires a victorious faith in the perpetual progress of our nature.

There is one characteristic of this power which belongs to truly great minds, particularly deserving notice. Far from enslaving, its makes more and more free, those on whom it is exercised; and in this respect it differs wholly from the vulgar sway which ambition thirsts for. It awakens a kindred power in others, calls their faculties into new life, and particularly strengthens them to follow their own deliberate convictions of truth and duty. It breathes conscious energy, self-respect, moral independence, and a scorn of every foreign yoke.

There is another power over men, very different from this; a power, not to quicken and elevate, but to crush and subdue; a power which robs men of the free use of their nature, takes them out of their own hands, and compels them to bend to another's will. This is the sway which men grasp at most eagerly, and which it is our great purpose to expose. To reign, to give laws, to clothe their own wills with omnipotence, to annihilate all other wills, to spoil the individual of that self-direction which is his most precious right; this has ever been deemed by multitudes the highest prize for competition and conflict. The most envied men are those, who have succeeded in prostrating multitudes, in subjecting whole communities, to their single will. It is the love of this power, in all its forms, which we are anxious to hold up to reprobation. If any crime should be placed by society beyond pardon, it is this.

This power has been exerted most conspicuously and perniciously by two classes of men—the priest or minister of religion, and the civil ruler. Both rely on the same instruments; that is,

pain or terror: the first, calling to his aid the fires and torments of the future world, and practising on the natural dread of invisible powers; and the latter, availing himself of chains, dungeons, and gibbets in the present life. Through these terrible applications, man has, in all ages, and in almost every country, been made, in a greater or less degree, a slave and machine; been shackled in all his faculties, and degraded into a tool of others' wills and passions. The influence of almost every political and religious institution has been, to make man abject in mind, fearful, servile, a mechanical repeater of opinions which he dares not try, and a contributor of his toil, sweat, and blood, to governments which never dreamed of the general weal as their only legitimate end. On the immense majority of men, thus wronged and enslaved, the consciousness of their own nature has not yet dawned; and the doctrine, that each has a mind, worth more than the material world, and framed to grow for ever by a self-forming, self-directing energy, is still a secret, a mystery, notwithstanding the clear annunciation of it, ages ago, by Jesus Christ. We know not a stronger proof of the intenseness and nefariousness of the love of power, than the fact, of its having virtually abrogated Christianity, and even turned into an engine of dominion, a revelation which breathes throughout the spirit of freedom, proclaims the essential equality of the human race, and directs its most solemn denunciations against the passion for rule and empire.

That this power, which consists in force and compulsion, in the imposition on the many of the will and judgment of one or a few, is of a low order, when compared with the quickening influence over others, of which we have before spoken, we need not stop to prove. But the remark is less obvious, though not less true, that it is not only inferior in kind, but in amount or degree. This may not be so easily acknowledged. He, whose will is passively obeyed by a nation, or whose creed is implicitly adopted by a spreading sect, may not easily believe, that his power is exceeded, not only in kind or quality, but in extent, by him who wields only the silent, subtle influence of moral and intellectual gifts. But the superiority of moral to arbitrary sway, in this particular, is proved by its effects. Moral power is creative; arbitrary power wastes away the spirit and force of those on whom it is exerted. And is it not a mightier work to create than to destroy? A higher energy is required to quicken than to crush; to elevate than to depress; to warm and expand than to chill and contract. Any hand, even the weakest, may take away life. Another agency is required to kindle or restore it. A vulgar incendiary may destroy in an hour a magnificent structure, the labour of ages. Has he energy to be compared with the creative intellect, in which this work had its origin? A fanatic of ordinary talent may send terror through a crowd; and by the craft, which is so often joined with fanaticism, may fasten on multitudes a debasing creed. Has he power to be compared with him, who rescues from darkness one only of these enslaved minds, and quickens it to think justly and nobly in relation to God, duty, and immortality? The energies of a single soul, awakened, by such an influence, to the free and full

use of its powers, may surpass, in their progress, the intellectual activity of a whole community, enchained and debased by fanaticism or outward force. Arbitrary power, whether civil or religious, if tried by the only fair test, that is, by its effects, seems to have more affinity with weakness than strength. It enfeebles and narrows what it acts upon. Its efficiency resembles that of darkness and cold in the natural world. True power is vivifying, productive, builds up, and gives strength. We have a noble type and manifestation of it in the sun, which calls forth and diffuses motion, life, energy, and beauty. He who succeeds in chaining men's understandings and breaking their wills, may indeed number millions as his subjects. But a weak, puny race, are the products of his sway, and they can only reach the stature and force of men by throwing off his yoke. He who, by an intellectual and moral energy, awakens kindred energy in others, touches springs of infinite might, gives impulse to faculties to which no bounds can be prescribed, begins an action which will never end. One great and kindling thought from a retired and obscure man, may live when thrones are fallen, and the memory of those who filled them obliterated, and like an undying fire, may illuminate and quicken all future generations. [*To be continued.*]

THE CHRISTIAN PIONEER.

GLASGOW, *August* 1, 1828.

THE Synod of Ulster assembled at Cookstown, on the last week in June. It was a memorable meeting. We cannot give all the proceedings; but those which relate to the establishment of as direful an Inquisition as ever was founded on the ruins of Mental Freedom and Christian Equality, we cannot refrain from recording.

Mr. *Morell* (Ballibay) rose to move the Resolutions. He said he would not detain the house with a recapitulation of the reasons which induced him to bring forward the motion he was about to propose, for the adoption of the Synod. These reasons he had before stated. He would now only say, that his object was, to secure peace and unity to the Synod of Ulster; and although he would sacrifice much for the obtaining of those objects, yet there were things which he could not give up, to obtain a temporary, but dangerous and insecure repose for this body. He could not give up his Bible—he could not give up his reliance for salvation on the Lord Jesus Christ, to procure this unity. He had heard an unfortunate expression yesterday, of a gentleman in that assembly, who had quoted the example of Jesus, in allowing Judas to remain with him, even when he knew he was about to betray him into the hands of his enemies; but if that gentleman found the example of Judas a good illustration of the situation in which that gentleman stood towards the Synod of Ulster, it is not to be

expected, he (Mr. Morell) would pin his faith on his sleeve. Mr. Morell then moved the following Resolutions:—

1. "That many of the evils that now unhappily exist in the Synod of Ulster, have arisen from the admission of persons, as preachers of the Gospel, who are ignorant of the Truth as it is in Jesus, unrenewed in the spirit of their minds, and, consequently, destitute of that zeal, which is necessary for the dissemination of the Gospel of Christ.

2. "That while we are individually bound to use all Scriptural means to guard against the continuance of these evils, it is also our duty, as a Church, to adopt such regulations, as may, with the Divine blessing, prove effectual to prevent the introduction of Ministers unenlightened by the Spirit of God, and to advance spiritual religion in our Church courts and congregations.

3. "That before any person be recognised as a candidate for the Ministry in the Church, he shall be enjoined to present himself at an annual meeting, previously to his entering a theological class, before a Committee of the Synod, who shall examine him respecting his personal religion, his knowledge of the Scriptures, and especially his views of the doctrines of the Trinity, Justification by Faith, and Regeneration by the Spirit; and his motives for offering himself as a candidate for the sacred office of a Minister of the Gospel.

4. "That Students, after having finished their theological course, and their trials in the Presbytery, shall again present themselves for a similar examination before the same Committee; and it shall be the duty of that Committee to ascertain their soundness in the Faith, by requiring from them a statement of their views of the doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith.

5. "That if any person thus licensed, shall afterwards be found not to preach the doctrines of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, or to avow any principles in opposition to those doctrines, he shall not be continued in fellowship with the Ministers of this body.

6. "Should any person be licensed or ordained in opposition to the above regulations, such license or ordination shall not be deemed valid by this body."

Mr. *Carlile* moved, that the resolutions be adopted. On various grounds, he approached the subject with deep feeling, and, in the outset, he acknowledged the difficulties that surrounded him.—He was placed amidst so many conflicting elements, that he was scarcely able clearly to see his way. He had not his own individual views to consult on this occasion, and he could not bring forward that which he would in all respects approve. He did not like the public agitation of such a subject, lest it should put a stop to the operations of an amending and purifying principle, which had for some time been abroad in the body. He would not have gone so far as those resolutions, but he must concede a good deal to the views of others; and as all that could be substantially required, was found in them, others, as well as he, should concede something. He liked the proposed plan, because it did not go to amend the state of the body by any specific act; for he could not conceive a regulation by which a body could make itself pure. Should a division of the Synod take place, he could not pretend to say which side would be the purer—those who retired, or those who staid. Like, he would not say an able, but a wise tactician, he had been preparing a retreat from the difficulties with which the body was threatened—a mode of keeping up the house before it came tumbling about his ears. He liked a gradual re-

formation, and he would leave the actual reformation in the hands of the Spirit of the Great God. The proposed resolutions went no farther than an appeal to the innate power of truth, and there they left the matter. But he also approved of them, because they were impartial. They did not affix a stigma on any particular body; but acknowledged generally that there are evils in the Synod, arising from past laxity. Though Arians may suppose that they are particularly referred to, yet, for himself, he did not specifically refer to them. There was more to lament on the side of the Orthodox themselves, and he more deeply deplored the corruptions on that side, than those on the side of the Arians. So far as he was concerned, he understood them to contemplate corruptions in general, though others might attach to them a more specific application. They seemed simply to recognise, what was an incumbent duty, independently of any code of discipline, *viz.* that in our public and private capacity, we should endeavour to ascertain the Christian character of every man who offers himself as a candidate for the ministry, and to resist the introduction of every one whose character and principles are doubtful. The first inquiry is, whether the individual be a Christian; and, secondly, whether he is qualified for the ministerial office. The Synod were bound to this, both by the Word of God and the reason of the thing. The reason why he can sit in the same church court with Arians, is, that by the constitution of the body, he can freely bear testimony to the truth. Were it an understood thing, that he should acquiesce in measures, merely because they had been voted by a majority, he could not for a moment longer be connected with it; but because he had the privilege of withstanding error, on that ground he could sit and deliberate in ecclesiastical affairs with any body. The scriptural phrases about withdrawing from heretics, and "coming out from among them," had been often brought forward, and as regularly misunderstood. He comes out from Arians when he testifies against them, as he comes out from the world when he testifies against its practices, though he may be living in the midst of it. It was not by changing his locality, that this command of God was obeyed. Conscientious Arians might regard themselves as bound to bring into the Synod men of their principles, as well as we. This he would not expect an Arian to give up. Observe, then, how the plan will work: A person appears before a Presbytery, and both parties are bound to act upon the same general principle. On examination, the Orthodox party come to the conclusion that he is not a Christian, or that his views do not coincide with those which they can sanction. Of course, they endeavour to keep him out, while others are equally anxious to keep him in. Suppose that he is licensed to preach, the Orthodox are bound to protest, and, if necessary, to report the matter to the Synod. In case of an Orthodox candidate, the Arians are bound to do the same. Hence, young men would take their certificates either from one side or other of the Presbytery, and, consequently, it would be known at once what were the views of the licentiate. For his own part, he would not, in the present state of the Synod, give any thing for the re-

commendation of a Presbytery. He had rather take a single letter from a judicious friend, in attestation of a Minister's character, so long as Arians and Trinitarians are playing into each other's hands. Those congregations who wish for an Arian Minister, will look to one side of the certificate, while those who think differently, will regard the other. It might be objected, that this would produce a warfare all over the country; but there must of necessity be a warfare—a perpetual struggle between light and darkness. He did not mean by these expressions, to convey any offensive sentiment, but just to elucidate the fact, that the parties would be constantly opposed to each other. He hoped, that by a faithful discharge of their duty, the places of the Arians would be filled up with Orthodox men: he did not conceal his wish that it should be so; but of one thing he was certain, that a human test was not the way to do it. Another objection was, the holding of ministerial communion with men of contrary sentiments: but whatever was the meaning of the objection, he either did not understand it, or did not concur in it. Communion in Scripture, means a communion of spirit and affection. He had no difficulty, for instance, in holding communion with Mr. Montgomery in money matters, or in ordinary business of the Synod. But, in propagating the Gospel, he could not hold communion with any of the Orthodox, who was a worldly-minded man—with one who was intent on the accumulation of wealth, and who would give £10 or £20 to the service of Satan, while he would with difficulty dole out some 5*s.* to promote the cause and work of God. With such a man he could not hold communion.

Another ground that was set up, was, that there was no standard for this body but the Word of God. The Christian Church was bound to set forward the Sacred Scriptures as the only book that contains rules of faith. It was said, we must have some definition of what the Scriptures mean. He did not think so; he had again and again sought for the grounds of this assertion in the Bible, but he had sought in vain. He saw there nothing of the sort, and he could not conscientiously accede to it. If a man professes to believe the Bible, he ought to be received. On that profession, he could recognise him as a Christian; but without examination of his life and character, he could not recognise him as a Christian Minister. This was the simple mode pursued in primitive times. We are to judge of him by our own conceptions of what the Bible requires; but there was no criterion by which one part of the Synod could be set apart as Christians, and the others not. That must be determined by the whole temper, and spirit, and character of the man. Instead of setting up logical men, to make a creed or code of laws out of the Scripture, the Scripture itself should be our creed. To it we should constantly refer, and, instead of bringing with us our codes of discipline, we should bring our Bibles; and till we do this, we shall never attain the character of a Scripture Church. Instead of suspending over those to whom the examination of our young men is entrusted, the terrors of the Church, we should declare, with the Bible in our hands, whether they have done their duty or not. Church

censures are easily got over, but the authority of the Bible is not so readily dispensed with. Our meetings would thus be rid of the legal forms, and a weight and a solemnity would be imparted to our proceedings. There was no intention of driving Arians out of the Synod, but there was an intention of driving out Arianism! The parties might go together, so far as they agree, and when they cannot, they might hold separate meetings without trenching on the integrity of this body. This is what is meant by withdrawing. Let men thus withdraw, when they cannot keep together; and let them keep together, when they can. This was the Redeemer's mode of procedure with the Pharisees, and that of Paul with the Jews at Ephesus and elsewhere. The Jews were then all Arians, or rather Socinians; yet he did not separate from them, till they contradicted and blasphemed. And whenever the Arians of the Synod of Ulster get up and contradict and blaspheme, he (Mr. C.) will leave them, but not till they make the Synod too hot to hold him! Again, he supported the resolutions, because the Synod might rest satisfied in them, and because they would save the necessity of driving out men, under whose authority, he, as well as others, came into that Synod. Would they turn out the very men from whom they had received their Ministry? He spoke in relation to those members of Synod who had been ordained by Arians. They, in particular, should lay down the ministry! They had it then from an impure source! And would any man tell him, that he should go to the street and permit a parcel of porters to set him apart to the ministry? But he would exemplify his reasoning. In the Synod of Munster, one of our Students has been introduced—a young man, of orthodox principles—he meant Mr. Ferris, of Fethard. Now, amongst those Arians he is permitted peaceably to act, and to bear testimony to the truth; and if so, he asked any sober-minded man, what is Mr. Ferris to do? Would you advise him to withdraw, and come out from among them? He (Mr. C.) would really and conscientiously say to Mr. Ferris, do not. If they require from you any thing contrary to your principles—if they make the Synod too hot for you, then withdraw. Suppose Mr. Ferris should succeed in getting his principles gradually introduced into the Synod, till he had secured a majority, is he then to turn the corner and expel those men who had kindly and affectionately received him? On the contrary, would not his individual success be an earnest, that where the testimony is increased, the Synod would soon become an orthodox body? In the Established Church, the members were not at liberty to agitate and divide, and hence an advancement of spiritual religion had taken place. This was a lesson to us; we had had experience of it; miracles had been wrought amongst us, by the simple operation of advice and testimony. When he (Mr. C.) first came to the Synod, no man would have been mad enough to propose the expulsion of Arians. They had then a most decided influence; and it was a cowardly resolution, the very moment we had secured a majority, that our consciences should begin to work, and that we should turn out the very men who brought us in. An attempt to purify a reli-

gious body, by a general principle of separation, has always failed, and it puts a damper on affectionate religion. Amongst ourselves, how deadening has been its effect! Look to the separation of the Antrim Presbytery. Did that extinguish Arianism? But if we once adopt the principle of separation, do the gentlemen imagine it will stop there? Would they not split among themselves? Would they not be bound to do so by their principles? With an Atheist he would hold communion in the promotion of a benevolent institution—with a Deist, in the belief of a Supreme Being—and with an Arian, in all things about which they were agreed. He would not apply to this body, a principle which does not apply to the lay members of every congregation. On the principles of some members of this body, they ought to go to every member of their congregations, to scrutinize his opinions, and refuse to take stipend from, and expel, every individual who differed from them. If this would not be likely to promote the good of congregations, is it likely to promote that of this body? It will, however, be said, let us do this first; but I ask, do you really contemplate the other?—(Yes, yes, from one of the back seats.) Well, I am glad to find men prepared to be consistent. When the matter was brought to his own doors, I did not expect that any man would answer yes. He would propose the arrangements contemplated in the resolutions, in which, however, he did not put much trust. He hoped the separation of the Synod would not be pressed: it was as contrary to the mind of the Spirit of God, as it would be destructive to the interests of that body.

Mr. *Cooke* rose to propose an Amendment to the original motion. Before he proceeded to speak to the question, he begged to correct a mistake that had been made, he did not say intentionally, in a public paper, regarding an expression used by him on an early day in the present meeting. He did not complain of this; he merely wished to set himself right with the house. Indeed, he felt he had been subjected to the same kind of misrepresentations at the last meeting in Strabane. He would, however, before the separation of this Synod, expose those calumnies under which he had lain for twelve months. He preferred waiting till the present time to do this, rather than contradict them in another way. He had, in the report of some expressions which had fallen from him on Tuesday last, whilst speaking on the subject of the Clerkship, been made to say, "he declared before God"—now, what would persons not present in this house, say, on reading this expression in the public newspapers? what would the Quakers say, when they read of a member of this religious body, swearing in such a profane manner? He again repeated, he did not complain of it, but he wished to put himself right with the house.

Mr. *Montgomery*.—I recollect perfectly, that Mr. Cooke used some very solemn expressions at the time referred to.

Mr. *Cooke*.—I did—I said "I *solemnly* declare." Mr. Cooke then proceeded to introduce his Amendment. The reformation proposed, was not a mere reformation from Arianism. It was designed to extend much farther, and to affect the corruptions of the Orthodox themselves. He did not by this, mean, that he

himself did not individually need reformation, both in point of zeal and ministerial faithfulness. He was really willing to go no farther than the resolutions proposed by Mr. Carlile; but he was willing to be convinced that he was wrong in the course he wished to adopt. His own opinion was, that the Synod should be separated; but he really wished to be convinced that he was wrong there too. The proposed resolutions were too vague and undefined—they amounted in fact to nothing, and that was the reason why Mr. Carlile supported them, and that was the reason why he also wished to amend them. They are so expressed, that every man can take his own meaning out of them. Mr. Carlile had said, that till the Jews blasphemed, Paul did not separate from them; and that till this is done, no separation should ever take place: and he (Mr. Cooke) just thought so too, and this was one of his reasons for wishing an immediate separation. He never supposed, that a Church Court can turn any man out of his congregation. On this subject, he had submitted for twelve months to a foul misrepresentation of his sentiments, which he would correct in due time. He would most probably himself separate, if some measure leading to a final separation is not adopted. He would do it, he was convinced, with a very small minority; but whether with ten, twelve, or twenty, he will do it, though he had not yet fully made up his mind. Respectability does not depend on numbers; and he was assured, he would separate with the blessing of God, and in the simple enjoyment of the Saviour's promise, "fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." It had been asked, would we apply to congregations the principles which we apply to the Synod? But Mr. Carlile forgets that there are differences of offices. He (Mr. Cooke) does carry the principle into his congregation, and it ought to be carried into every congregation. He baptizes the children of none who have not given a satisfactory profession of their faith; and if any whose principles are dubious, apply for admission to the communion, they are refused. When Mr. Carlile talked of stipends constituting a title to church membership, he forgot his Bible. Was Darius a member of the Jewish Church, because he paid stipends to the temple? In a certain congregation in Belfast, Roman Catholics have seats and pay stipends, and are they members of the Church? Really, this is one of the most extraordinary doctrines ever advanced; but the fact is, the payment of stipends is a mere temporal arrangement with the congregational committee, and has nothing whatever to do with church privileges. His Majesty's Government pay us stipends, and I dare say they do not to this hour know that they are members of the Presbyterian Church.—(A Laugh.) Mr. Cooke then read the following Amendment:—

"1. That many of the evils that now unhappily exist in the General Synod of Ulster, have arisen from the admission of persons holding Arian sentiments, contrary to the accredited standards of this body, as founded on the Word of God; from the occasional admission of others, who, though nominally holding in sound words and profession the form of Godliness, were yet deniers of the power thereof, and, consequently, destitute of that zeal which is necessary to the dissemination of the Gospel.

"2. That while we are individually bound to use all Scriptural means to guard against the continuance of these evils, it is also our duty, as a Church, to adopt such regulations as may, with the Divine blessing, prove effectual to prevent the introduction of Ministers unenlightened by the Spirit of God, and to advance spiritual religion in our Church courts and congregations.

"3. That before any person be recognised as a candidate for the Ministry, he shall, previously to entering a theological class, be enjoined to present himself at our annual meeting, to be examined by a Committee of this Synod, respecting his personal religion, his knowledge of the Scriptures, especially his views of the doctrines of the Trinity, Original Sin, Justification by Faith, and Regeneration by the Holy Spirit; and likewise as to his motives for offering himself as a candidate for the sacred office of the Ministry; and that should any such examinant be found opposed to those doctrines, or appear to be destitute of vital Godliness, he shall, in no case, be recognised as a candidate for the Ministry in this Synod.

"4. That Students, after having finished their theological course, and their trials in the Presbytery, shall again present themselves for a similar examination before the same Committee; and it shall be the duty of that Committee to ascertain their soundness in the Faith, by requiring from them a statement of their views of the doctrines contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith.

"5. That if any person thus licensed, be afterwards found not to preach the doctrines of the Trinity, Original Sin, and Justification by Faith, and Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, or to avow any principles in opposition to these doctrines, he shall not be continued in fellowship with this body.

"6. Persons who are already Preachers in this body, but have not been licensed according to these regulations, shall, previously to ordination, be required to undergo a similar examination.

"7. Should any person be licensed or ordained in opposition to these regulations, such license or ordination shall not be deemed valid by this body.

"8. The Committee for these examinations shall annually be appointed in open Synod."

Here, he said, it was distinctly acknowledged, that the evils complained of, had originated in the admission of Arians. First, because it was contrary to the accredited standards of this Church. The law had never been repealed, which enjoined subscription to the Westminster Confession, as a complete formula of religious doctrine. Second, that though much evil had resulted from Arianism, yet an orthodox minister with a heterodox life, was a much worse character. The second resolution was the same as the original. Mr. Carlile concluded by commenting in succession on the amended resolutions. Some discussion here took place about the mode in which the proposed Committee should be appointed, which in the present stage of the question was deemed irrelevant. Mr. Cooke then said, that Mr. Carlile had stated a fact which, from the ingenious manner in which it was introduced, seemed very important. He had most decided objections against making church members a kind of forty-shilling freeholders, and he had given notice of a motion that would, if adopted, abolish the abuse. When the period of discussion arrived, he (Mr. Cooke) would defend the principles of the Westminster Confession, and he would vindicate himself from attacks that had been made on him.

Mr. *S. Dill* seconded Mr. Cooke's Amendment.

Mr. *Carlile* explained.—With regard to stipends, he spoke in relation to the existing law of the Synod, of the principle of which he disapproved, as well as Mr. Cooke. Between voting and membership, a distinction had been made by Mr. Cooke, but he must recollect, that the existing law makes payment of stipends a part of church-membership, and he has only given a notice of a motion for its repeal, which probably will not pass for twenty years to come. But with regard to the general question, St. Paul did not attempt to make a division in the Jewish body, on the occasion alluded to. He merely withdrew, without putting it to a vote, and, in similar circumstances, a person was not warranted in acting otherwise than going out quietly, and taking all that were willing to go with him.

Mr. *Armour* opposed the amended resolutions, though in principle he avowed himself as much attached to Orthodoxy as any of his brethren.

Mr. *S. Dill*, in an energetic speech of great length, which was delivered with much animation, pointed out the evils of Arianism, and its opposition to the declarations of the Sacred Volume. He strongly urged the necessity of a reformation in the Church.

Mr. *Campbell* (Templepatrick) said, he had objected against tests last year, at Strabane, and that he still continued so to do. We should, said he, consider the opinions of men in other assemblies, and learn from their example. In the House of Commons, Sir Francis Burdett, in his speech on the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, said, "Tests can be no support to any Church." The Bishop of Chester also observed, in his place, "Tests are unfriendly to sincerity—they are premiums to religious insincerity." And what said the Archbishop of Tuam, on the Catholic Emancipation Bill? "Under a decree of Pope Pius IV. in the 14th Article, the Catholics admit the Scriptures as they are received by the Holy Mother Church, whose right it is to judge and interpret them, and as such we receive them." To which decree we are now likely to accede, saying to our students and to ourselves, "Go, search, study and examine the Scriptures; but come to our tribunal, and submit to our interpretation, for your opinion of those matters must coincide with our decision. I here (said Mr. C.) take the opportunity of saying, that it is pleasing to observe that men express their willingness to exercise their reasoning powers. They show, by their arguments this day, that reason is the gift of God; and use their understanding to convince us and others who differ from them, that we are in error. But whenever we approach these matters, the cry is heard—"Will you dare to bring to your weak and fallible reason, the doctrines of Revelation? No! Attempt not to approach this subject: be cautious in these matters! Remember the injunction given to Moses—'Draw not hither; cast thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where thou treadest is holy ground!'" Permit me to say to such men, that one great cause of the spread and establishment of Christianity, at its introduction, was its consonancy to reason—which, I am firmly persuaded, favoured its progress, and will, in the end, render it triumphant; for I am convinced of its subduing all other religions to itself, and that the prophetic predictions shall be fulfilled. Before it, the false religions of the world are daily and hourly fading; and the time will assuredly come, when, through its superior excellency, the system taught by Confucius, the great Eastern philosopher—the system contained in the Alcoran of Mahomet—and even the Jewish system, given by Moses, though that also was from God, shall shrivel into nonentity; and why? because it is more agreeable to reason, and to minds capable of distinguishing betwixt truth and error. I should not, Sir, have spoken on these proposed regulations, if they had been prospective only; but to me they appear to have a retrospective effect. They speak of the accredited standards of our Church, from which we have departed. We, Sir, have improved,

and are apparently improving, in the way we have pursued. Look round this house, Sir; see the talent, the eloquence, and power, that pervades it, which have rendered it respectable in the eyes of the community, and superior to those who have preceded us. This has arisen from the attention of Presbyteries to the education of students. Adieu to the old system—it has wrought well—let it still have its influence. Sir, your new regulations encroach on the rights of the laity. Your young licentiates may be the choice of the people, but to this Committee they must be brought; and unless they agree with their doctrines, shall not be ordained among them, however acceptable and useful their instruction be. Sir, these regulations reflect much on the character of the members of this body. They speak of inattention to their moral practice at the time of their introduction—that because of the laxity of Synod, with regard to their conduct, Christianity has been injured. This, Sir, is sufficient for me to reject this amended overture.

Mr. *Elder* said, he had been 48 years a member of that Synod, and he was astonished to find that not less than 32 Ministers and 18 Elders had denied the doctrine of the Trinity. Mr. Porter, he said, was an amiable man, but he could hold no ministerial communion with him. Mr. Montgomery was a learned man, but it was a ground of lamentation that such eminent talents should not be employed in displaying the glories of the adorable Trinity! The Resolutions, he contended, were imperfect, unless the Arians were excluded. The Deity of Jesus Christ was so clearly pointed out in Scripture, that it was astonishing any man should deny it! He was unwilling to say it, but an Arian could not be a Christian, and he could not have saving faith; for, according to the Apostle John, every Arian is not only a Deist, but an Atheist, "he that denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father!" Mr. Elder then proceeded to argue from the attributes, works, and worship ascribed to the Saviour, that he can be no other than the Supreme God. When Stephen committed his spirit into the hands of Christ Jesus,—if he were not God, might he not as well have committed it into the hands of Abraham, Gabriel, or John Knox! After a number of observations, Mr. E. concluded by expressing his approbation of the Resolutions, so far as they went.

Mr. *H. Montgomery* was sorry to hear the old and respectable gentleman say, that Arians "denied the Lord that bought them."—There never was a more unfounded calumny, and he would engage to show, before to-morrow night, that there was not a particle of truth in the assertion.

Mr. *John Brown* said, Whatever liberties I may take in the pulpit, I feel myself bound not to trespass on an assembly like this; and beg, therefore, to be called to order, should I wander from the question. I approach this subject with feelings of awe, like one dreading the explosion of a mine, because I feel a strong attachment to the Synod of Ulster. Though very unhappy when contemplating the agitations of this body, my hope and prayer, is, that the great Head of the Church will overrule them to promote our best interests; and that, as the closed volcano becomes the abode of verdure, and the terrific thunder often precedes fructifying showers, and renders the atmosphere wholesome, so these agitations, I trust, will promote the purification of this body, and precede the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the consequent adornment of our Zion with the beauties of holiness. I prefer the amended to the original overtures; because, though both tend to secure the same object, the former do so in a more open and candid manner;—the latter appear to me like a masked battery, but the former plainly specify Arianism to be the disease to which we are to apply a remedy, and, in attacking this system, I wish no disguise. Though I have no intention to follow the example of some, who boast of their study and acquirements, and though

I am free to admit that I am but a child in knowledge, if compared with Mr. Carlile, yet the views of that gentleman, whom I love and venerate, appear to me so visionary on the subject of ministerial communion, that I must protest against them. When Christ prayed that his followers should be of one mind, he appears to me to have established the necessity of unity in sentiment and feeling among them; and, in point of fact, how is it possible for persons to walk or act in harmony, who are not agreed on the essential truths of Christianity—the dignity of Zion's King, and the influence of his atonement? I maintain, moreover, that facts established by our experience, have proved the evil of disagreement in doctrine. This Church moved forward gloriously, disseminating pure religion, until Arianism was engrafted upon it, when it became stationary, and paralyzed; and its late movements have all been made under an Orthodox banner. What facts so clearly demonstrated, might have been expected from the nature of the case. Any farmer would see that a three-horse plough could never serve his purposes, if two horses were opposed to one! The two might drag the one with them by superior strength, but the constant struggle would arrest the labours of the ploughman! And so I maintain, that discord in this body, wherein Arianism has antagonized Orthodoxy, has of late produced a violent struggle; or, if struggling has been avoided, it has been by complete inactivity.—But, while I rejoice in the freedom afforded by the *Pacific Act*, I am opposed to a Latitudinarian faith. The compilers of our standards stood on high vantage ground, as they wrote or compiled their creed at a later period than other reformed churches, and availed themselves of their labours; and certainly this Church, in the days of her glory, maintained a uniform creed. Some gentlemen spoke, as though the code of 1825 changed our constitution; but, in it the Westminster Confession was recoguised as a test of Orthodoxy; and, though examination was permitted instead of subscription, this opened no door to Arians. If any of them were admitted heretofore, they *crept in unawares;* and to suppose that the code, which represented the Westminster Confession as a test of soundness in the faith, was intended to open the door to Arians, would be to prove that its compilers had practised with effect the maxims of Loyola. My wish, is, that men's sentiments may be fairly known, by a creed which they have examined dispassionately, and subscribed conscientiously. It has been asserted, that the adoption of a test infringes on the right of private judgment. Now, this right I deem invaluable, and disclaim all interference with it. I assert, however, that many of its clamorous advocates mistake its nature, and wish to trench on the privileges of others. I think it too evident to require proof, that every voluntary association, like this body, has a right to frame laws for its government and preservation, and no man is injured whom its laws exclude. Were this Synod to pass resolutions, to direct Banking Companies, or Farming Societies, it would be felt that we were going beyond the limits of our duty. Surely, then, the charge of arrogance recoils on the heads of those men, however elevated in the world, who have ventured to prescribe the course to be pursued by this body, though its members are responsible to the tribunal of Heaven. I believe that poor men often read and understand their Bibles as well as the wealthy, who ride in splendour. I can easily understand why wealthy men, mistaking the cringing respect shown to mammon, as though it were shown to themselves, have indulged in this arrogance; and, while I regret that any of our members have encouraged this by flattery, I do hope, that spurning the trammels which they would impose, will act and think for themselves. I may be told, indeed, that we should follow the leadings of Providence, and not spoil the gem. I think, however, that men may mistake the leadings of Providence; but God's Word is plain, as it is unerring; and it says, "Come out from among them"—"bid them not God's speed, who bring another Gospel."

References have been made to former periods of our history, when our ancestors differed, but maintained unity. The cases are not parallel—they were agreed about the Head of the Church. I see no advantage from our present unnatural association. If Arians are right in their views, I am an idolater. If I am right, they worship another God than the God of revelation. The few Arians that exist in this Synod, press upon it like an incubus, binding down its energies, and disturbing its peace. St. Paul speaks of a *body of death*, from which he panted for deliverance; and not more ardent was his desire of deliverance from sin, than is Presbyterian Ulster to be freed from this evil affixed to pride by the enemy of souls! I am disposed to exchange the courtesies of life with Arians, and to display to their persons every feeling of benevolence; but I love my Saviour too much to wish religious intercourse with those who would rob him of his glory. I have avoided debating the principle of Arianism, for I trust that this body will never submit to the degradation of entertaining such a question! Without deciding, whether or not we should exclude the few infected with this disease that are among us (for this question is not before us), I trust that we shall shut the door against all such in future; and, therefore, I shall vote for the amended overtures.

Mr. *Johnston* (Tullylish) congratulated the Synod on the evident improvement which had taken place in the morals of its preachers, during the last few years. He then went on to argue in favour of Mr. Cooke's amendment. He said it had two objects in view, *viz.* 1st, To ascertain men's opinions regarding Justification by Faith, Original Sin, Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and the Supreme Deity of Christ; 2d, That the persons holding these opinions should be men of personal piety. In entering on the consideration of doctrine, those on the opposite side seemed to adopt the sentiment of Mr. Brougham, that "a man was no more accountable for his belief, than for the hue of his skin, or the height of his stature." And, therefore, they argued that man had no power over his faith. The Scriptures (said Mr. J.) seem to place this point in a different light. Thus, at John vii. 16, 17, we find that "Jesus answered them, and said, my doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Here, (continued Mr. J.) willingness to do the will of God, is connected with knowing it. So that if there be any pride of understanding disinclining us to receive any truth we cannot comprehend, or any perverseness of will determining us to follow our own way, whatever it is, it sets up a fatal barrier against receiving the truth, and must be criminal and dangerous. Mr. Johnston then adduced, at considerable length, arguments in favour of Creeds, and of the necessity of knowing that men are renewed in the spirit, before they be allowed to enter the Ministry.

Mr. *M'Culloch* (Newtownards). In the Committee he had opposed that flimsy paper, and its equally flimsy offspring, the amendment. It was like binding an artery with a cobweb instead of a ligature. Both should be laid aside, and a separation effected. It was in vain to apply such a panacea to the Synod—there were no less than 18 memorials, which had been forwarded to the Synod, urging a separation; and did that immense body of people which now crowded the house, come here for nothing? They came expecting a result, and throughout the country, the ferment and the agitation, and the anxiety of the people were equally strong. Mr. M'Culloch took a historical view of the state of Christianity, and the influence of Arianism in paralyzing its vitality through successive periods. Among other things, he said, that it lays the foundation of infidelity, and a total rejection of Revelation, by bringing the Son of God below absolute Deity, to be the Son of a mother, "such as I am!" The Arian gradually stretches his mind beyond his

system into Deism, and, by a natural progress, he settles down into point blank Atheism! He argued for a direct separation. It had been alleged, let the Synod alone, and it will mend. But he would say, in the words of Peter Pindar, in relation to Mr. Pitt—

> "Some say, he'll mend. What! mend a mummer?
> He'll mend just like sour ale in summer!"—(A laugh.)

It has been said, that the Orthodox had in this contest been the aggressors—the reverse was the case. The Unitarian Societies of England had been supplying the North of Ireland with their publications. The sermons of Price and Channing had been reprinted and widely circulated, and if any thing at all would make men Arians, these works would do it. A very clever man, a divine from this county, said he, once wanted to give my son some Unitarian tracts. I would not let him. He then wanted him to his house, to converse with him. I would not permit that either. I knew the danger, for, God forgive me, I believe I was once a little contaminated myself!! Yet (said Mr. M'C.) I hope we shall all meet in heaven.—(A laugh.)

Dr. *Wright* strongly animadverted on the speech of Mr. M'Culloch. It was singular, he said, that Mr. M'Culloch could not sit in church government with men because they were infidels, and yet he expected to meet them at the right hand of God. He opposed *in toto* the doctrine of separation, because, by persecution, no good had ever been effected, and he was persuaded never would. He was himself conscientiously attached to Calvinistic principles, but he was no party man—he had stood aloof from all parties, and he would most cordially vote for the original overture.

Mr. *M'Cance* explained his observations relative to Judas, of which he complained that an unfair use had been made, and one against which he protested. The Synod adjourned till eight o'clock next morning.

Mr. *Barnett* (of Moneymore) said, he would oppose the whole of these resolutions, though he approved of some of them abstractly, because he regarded them as insufficient instruments to accomplish a particular purpose. They were but insidious modes of doing what should be done openly, honestly, and avowedly. They were intended to get rid of certain members of the Synod; but would the proposed reformation of morals have been touched, had not the other been contemplated? Again, he would oppose them, because they could not be adopted without overlooking several injunctions of the book of God. Mr. B. referred to Gal. i. 7, in which the introduction of "another gospel" is noticed—and what course did the Apostle recommend? "I would they were even cut off that trouble you,"—though their error consisted in merely making some Jewish ceremonies part of the grounds of their acceptance with God. "A man who is a heretic, after the first and second admonition," the Church is enjoined to "reject." We are required to "mark those who cause divisions, and to avoid them." If this, then, was the Scriptural mode, he could not adopt the resolutions. The same truth was evident from the figures employed to designate the Church of God. She is a witness—"ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord;"—and is it not the duty of a witness to declare the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? If this is the case with regard to the petty concerns of time, how much more so is it in relation to the important and imperishable interests of the Head of the Church? Testimony should be consistent and harmonious; and is it possible for that of this Church to be so? Again, as an associated body, united to the same Redeemer, it is our duty to be joined together in unfeigned love and affection—knit together in the faith of the Gospel; but though for his Arian brethren, he might cherish a love of benevolence as men, he could not, consistently with his principles, *love* men whom he believed to be "enemies to the cross of

Christ." The very constitution of human nature forbids it. Many interpreters, he was aware, understood the unity mentioned in Scripture, of a unity of affection, but the very variety of the terms employed, shows the erroneous nature of the interpretation. Christians should be united, not only "in the same mind, but in the same *judgment*." It was impossible he could have a cordial affection, whose opinions were at perfect antipodes with his, and whose creed did not constitute him a Christian. The Synod professed to regard the Scriptures, and he called on the members to perform their duty to the Head of the Church. Mr. Carlile had proposed that we should come with a Bible under one arm, and a Concordance under the other; but would not this lead to a scene of holy gladiatorship, to which the exhibition of Pope and Maguire was nothing? Arians are honest men as well as we, and they could not hear their principles run down; and hence, there could be no permanent peace. How can two walk together, unless they be agreed? Must we not regard Arians as not believing in the true God? Must we not regard them as idolators, and must not they regard me as such? How, then, can we prosecute the ends which the Church was established to promote? In no other way can it be done, but by separation. Let us take a familiar example; suppose a man and wife to be eternally disagreeing, would they not live in far better harmony by taking different houses? Here we have no communion, but merely juxta position. Let any man look back to the scenes that have been exhibited for years past, and say what kind of communion we have had; and may we not argue from the past to the future? With Roman Catholics we are at present living in sufficient harmony; but let us once come to a contest whose principles shall predominate, and we shall soon see the scene changed. Again, he opposed the Resolutions, because they offered a direct and gross insult to our Arian friends. This might seem a singular reason, but he would show how it was:—You want them to join in extirpating the principles which they themselves are bound before God and man to maintain. You are directly requiring them to violate their consciences, and thus you are insulting them; but he (Mr. B.) had too great a respect for them, to treat them in any such manner. The effect of our continuing together, has been, that both parties have been trammelled and fettered in teaching their principles; and how must honest men feel in such a situation?—This observation was corroborated by the conduct of Mr. Montgomery, at the last Synod. He went out, because he would not, he said, witness an awful scene—an appalling and excruciating scene—men standing up, and in the presence of heaven declaring a falsehood. Men, in the present state of things, were subjected to temptation; but would the case be so, if the Synod were divided? Lastly, he wished to be regarded by Arians as an honest man; and how should he be so, if he were not desirous of a separation?—It had been asked by Mr. Carlile, would you apply to individual members of congregations, the principles proposed to be applied to this body? He (Mr. B.) did so apply them. He admitted none to the communion—he baptized the children of none, of whose orthodoxy he was not satisfied.—After some observations on the subject of creeds, Mr. B. concluded by opposing the Resolutions, for the reasons stated.

Dr. *Wright* here explained.

Mr. *John Hogg* (of Carlan) rose and said, Moderator, I am one of those who give my brethren in the Ministry credit for purity of intention; I therefore conclude, that the glory of God, and the salvation of immortal souls, is the great end we all have in view. I would then put it to the good sense of the house, whether there be the least probability that one additional soul shall be saved, by cutting off that part of the Synod which we believe to be in error. By so doing, you prevent them hearing our debates,—you put them out of the way of getting information,—

and you, in fact, exclude them as it were from the pale of the Church: and, there is one important fact, which should never be forgotten, that *an Arian has no worldly temptation to adhere to his favourite opinions—interest lies on the other side.* If Mr. Montgomery should change his opinions, it is most likely he should be chosen by a congregation nearer to the Institution, than the respectable one in which he now officiates. A gentleman, in yesterday's debate, quoted a sentence from Mr. Brougham's speech, addressed as Lord Rector to the Students of the University of Glasgow; in which that distinguished senator is reported to have said, that "a man was no more accountable for his belief, than for the form of his face, or the height of his body." But, in opposition to this, he referred to John chap. vii. v. 17, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." The gentleman's object undoubtedly was, by this, to show, that Arians were culpable in not doing the will of God; otherwise they must have been put in possession of the true doctrine. But, Sir, if we believe Arians, they have prayed to God, that their minds may be illuminated, and that they might be led into all truth. The conclusion which charity obliges us to draw, is, that they *shall* not be suffered to fall into fatal error. Indeed, Sir, many of the similies which have been made upon this subject, are either absurd in themselves, or neutralize each other. Orthodoxy and Arianism have been compared to three horses in a plough—two drawing in one direction, and the third in an opposite! But, Sir, do not Arians direct their hearers to walk in the footsteps, and follow the example of their blessed Master; and tell them that no other path can conduct them to the regions of blessedness. Arianism has been likened to a dead body, and a burning mount. I may surely venture to affirm, that it cannot be a volcano and a putrid carcase, at the same time. It is said, we cannot expect unanimity as long as we remain together. I should like to ask, could we promise ourselves unanimity had this separation actually taken place? I should wish to know what kind of creed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Barnett themselves could sign? Do they entertain exactly the same sentiments on the subject of original sin? Are they agreed with respect to the extent of the atonement? Does not the one believe that the grace of God is *resistible*—and does not the other teach, that we are entirely *passive* in the work of regeneration, and that we have no power whatever to frustrate the grace of God? It has also been argued, that we cannot expect peace, so long as the Synod remain entire. Peace is a most valuable blessing; but who, Sir, have been, and are, at this moment, the disturbers of the peace of this body? Those gentlemen remind me of what I lately read in some of the public prints. At the conclusion of the late war between Great Britain and America, hand-bills were posted in Philadelphia, announcing the grateful tidings of peace. One of our shrewd countrymen asked a gentlemen, whilst reading one of those papers, what it contained? Being informed, he further begged to know what they were fighting for? The gentleman replied, that it was for peace. Arrah, master, said the Hibernian, had they not that before they began?

Mr. *N. Alexander* (Crumlin) declared himself an enemy to all human creeds, tests, and confessions, as fetters upon the free soul of man—the inventions of men, for which they can find no authority in the Scriptures. This was evident, from the two shadowy arguments of Mr. Dill yesterday. The first was Peter's answer to our Lord, when he asked "whom he supposed him to be. Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And the second was, the good profession Timothy had made before many witnesses. Now, it was evident, that neither of these could be called a confession *prescribed* to Peter or Timothy, by a confessor, as the present is; and, at all events, could be no authority for imposing on Ministers a confession regarding the Trinity, that sublime

mystery, not to be found in the Scriptures, except in the Epistle of John—"There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one"—a verse that has been given up as an interpolation by Trinitarians themselves. ("No, no"—"Yes yes.") I am not an Arian (says Mr. A.) but, after carefully perusing the Word of God, and after much reading on the subject, from my youth till the present time, I am an Anti-Trinitarian. I cannot see the doctrine of three Almighty, Eternal Beings, or Persons, in the Scriptures; each possessed of what each of the other two persons is possessed of, namely, ALL MIGHT: and the oneness of the persons seems to me, not to signify the sameness in substance, equality in power and glory, but oneness in *purpose*, as appears from our Lord praying that the disciples may be one, *even* as the Father and he are one. I not only oppose this test, because I cannot find it in the Scriptures, but I oppose all human tests, as assumptions of infallibility, and reliques of Popery. All the grounds of scriptural exclusion, are impenitent iniquity, and not loving the Lord Jesus Christ, and, of course, not obeying his law of love to man. Tests are either agreeable to the Word of God, or they are not. If they are agreeable to the Word of God, they are superseded by the superior Word of God, and are therefore useless, and to be rejected. If they are not agreeable to the Word of God, they are sinful, and therefore to be rejected. Again, no supplements to the Word of God (such as tests and confessions) ought to be adopted, unless made by infallible men. Since the time of the Apostles, there are *no* infallible men; therefore no such supplements, as tests or confessions, ought to be adopted. Again, human tests are either intended to be permanently binding, or they are not intended to be so. If they are *not* intended to be so, they may be changed the day after they are made, and are therefore useless. If they are intended to be permanently binding, they bind those that sign them, never to be wiser than they are at present; and, therefore, being a sinful drag on improvement, ought to be rejected. The use of tests implies that the Spirit of God could not foresee, or provide against all future errors, in the Holy Word of God; it is, therefore, a libel on that Spirit. The only test that I can see necessary, then, is a minute examination of the young men on the Scriptures, the only infallible guide given to us in our present state of trial.

The house was then addressed by Mr. *F. Dill*, in favour of the Amendment; and Mr. *Brown* (Tobermore) against it.

Mr. *Fletcher Blakeley* (of Moneyrea) spoke to the following effect:—I rise to oppose the amended overture with the best of my ability; and, in doing so, while it is well known that I am no Trinitarian, I wish it to be understood that I am not a disciple of Arius or Socinus. As gross misrepresentations, however, of the sentiments of these persons have been made in this assembly, I may before I conclude, claim your indulgence in stating them from some authorities that cannot fairly be disputed. This may be deemed a departure from the question; but I do, notwithstanding, pledge myself to keep closer to it than any speaker that has gone before me. And, in pursuing this course, I must forget all popular feelings which have been so frequently and so shamefully appealed to, and speak as if in the hearing of God alone, whose all-seeing eye is every where present. I have heard, Sir, much pompous declamation concerning religious liberty, and the right of private judgment; but as nothing definite has been said, I am at a loss to know whether the gentlemen who have supported the amendment, mean their own religious liberty and right of private judgment, or those of their brethren. In either case, I would humbly recommend them to remember one beautiful passage of Scripture—"If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's." Notwithstanding the high-sounding phrases which have been used in

connection with religious liberty, I am surprised that this liberty is so badly understood, and so sadly abused. In the exercise of the right of private judgment, I have taken Christ for my Master; and, however much some may be alarmed, I tell you candidly and boldly, that I have *now no liberty to serve other masters:* and I trust, that neither the fear of persecution, nor of death, shall influence me to break my engagement, and choose Synods or Councils in his stead. "One is my Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren"—"No man can serve two masters." Even the Apostles, who were divinely inspired, said to the early disciples, "not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy." I have heard long and loud speeches respecting the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as a perfect rule of faith and practice; and, if I be not much misinformed, there have been long and loud lectures delivered, by some of my Orthodox brethren now present, to convince the Roman Catholics of the perfection of the Sacred Scriptures for these purposes. But how unaccountably strange is it, that these very gentlemen are attempting to establish, in this place, the very things which they wished to free the Roman Catholics of in another place. It would be a most glorious boast, if their conduct were in unison with their profession; but the gentlemen who are one moment strenuous in urging the importance and sufficiency of Scripture in all matters of religion, are, the next, noisy in advocating the necessity of human creeds and confessions. Be it remembered, that Jesus Christ is, to every humble disciple, not only "the *author*, but the *finisher* of his faith." "All Scripture, given by inspiration of God, is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works:" not merely furnished, but *thoroughly* furnished. Besides, if this amended overture contains nothing but what is in the Scriptures, it is superfluous; and, if it contain any thing contrary to the Scriptures, it should be rejected. If any suppose the Scriptures not plain enough to be a rule and centre of union, how shall we mend the matter? Can we express the ideas of Jesus Christ in clearer and better terms than himself? Can we express the ideas of his Apostles, who wrote and preached under the inspiration of God, in plainer and better words than they? Can we put our ideas on an equal footing with any of these? Can we improve that which we declare to be perfect? If all the Synods and Councils in the world should make this presumptuous attempt, they cannot have my concurrence. For there can be no medium between an earthly infallible head of the Church, and the sufficiency of the Word of God: if any such medium can be found, let it be pointed out. No individual in this large assembly dare assume the right of dictating to me in matters of faith; and if no individual will attempt it, how can numbers create the right? You might as well, Sir, think to make an arithmetical sum out of noughts. We must understand the Scriptures before we can make a *rule* by which the Scriptures are to be understood; and yet, according to the views of my brethren on the other side, we must apply that rule for understanding the Scriptures, which we must have understood before it was made. This is evidently most strange and preposterous. If we cannot bind a man's conscience by the divine Word of God, no human composition, however excellent, can bind him: and, in proportion as we fix our affections on human and fallible creeds, and tests, and articles, in the same proportion must we forget the divine and infallible creed contained in the Holy Bible. And it is absolute mockery to grant the right of private judgment in the examination of the Bible, and then reproach and injure a man, because he cannot see every passage in the same light as his neighbour, who is as liable to err as himself. It has been said, that the object of human creeds is to establish *uniformity!* When and where, Sir—in what church or country, or kingdom, has this uniformity been established?

Attempts, without number, have been made; and they have all failed. The celebrated Lord Chatham, when speaking in his capacity as a senator, said, of one of the most learned churches in the world, "we have a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy." There may be a pretended uniformity,—there may be a usurped authority, which may injure the best feelings of our nature, and hurt the best charities of life. But what want of uniformity has been exemplified in the supporters of human tests and standards, and of this strange and unexpected overture, may be seen, before we conclude, by appeals to the living and the dead. Before I proceed to notice this pretended uniformity, I beg leave to notice the singular sentiments of my friend, Mr. Barnett, for whose head and heart I have a high regard. He has urged the great dangers of Arianism, and the great advantage of a church being of the same faith,—of one mind. How strange is it, that Mr. Barnett left a Church, professing to be of one mind, and volunteered in uniting himself to one, where there is such a variety of opinion, and in which there are so many dangers! (Hear, hear, from all quarters.) I say to him, if he be so much alarmed, repent and return to that Church pretending to uniformity. I am utterly astonished at the expressions of Mr. Francis Dill, in referring to the Confession of Faith as the ancient standard of this Church. He has pleaded his youth in asking for information; but I must tell him, and, in doing so, I do not wish to wound his feelings, nor those of any other individual in this large assembly, that, on account of his age, I wonder at his ignorance. This Church, I tell him, was long established before the Confession of Faith was compiled, and even before the present translation of the Scriptures was made. I might have referred him to the sexton of my congregation, for information on these particulars.—I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence, and I shall now proceed, under your protection, to give some authorities to prove the shamefulness of the attacks that have been made upon me and my friends, and how fruitless have been the attempts at uniformity among Trinitarians themselves. I am asked to name my authorities, and I reply, that I shall be happy to lend the original works to any gentleman who calls the authorities in question.

Can any one really believe, that the Unitarians are to be classed with infidels? Is a man, who believes that Jesus is a teacher sent from God, that he taught the words of eternal life, that he wrought miracles, that he was raised from the dead, that he ascended into heaven, and that, in due time, he will return to raise the dead and judge the world, and who governs his conduct by the faith and hope of the Gospel—is this man no Christian? Is he to be regarded as a blasphemer and an infidel, as one who brands Jesus as an impostor, and his Gospel as a fable? Was Lardner, an infidel?—Lardner, whom all parties agree to praise, and who has done more to establish the truth and to exemplify the spirit of Christianity, than almost any writer since the age of the Apostles? Yet, Lardner was a Unitarian—he believed no Trinity. And if Lardner, and they who think with Lardner, are to be excluded from the pale of Christian communion, who is entitled to admission? In a dark and barbarous age, when ignorance and bigotry were universal, and a degraded laity were the abject slaves of a miserable and unlettered priesthood, nothing was too absurd for an arrogant priest to teach, or an ignorant and priest-ridden layman to believe. But that hour is passed. And it is rather too much for a man of sense and learning, who knows any thing of the world, in the present liberal and inquisitive age, to affect to thunder out anathemas upon those who hold different opinions from his own, and to consign to everlasting torments, men whose characters are unimpeachable, merely because they cannot subscribe to his metaphysical creed—because they prefer the doctrine of Dr. Wallis to that of Bishop Gastrell—the doctrine which was formerly approved by the

University of Oxford, to that which has lately been sanctioned by the University press. Let every man, therefore, according to the Apostolic rule, "freely enjoy his own opinion." Let Unitarians believe with Dr. Wallis, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are no more three distinct intelligent persons, than the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, are three Gods; and let Dr. Sherlock and his partizans believe, if they like, that the three persons of the Trinity are as much three distinct infinite minds, as Peter, James, and John, are three men. Let the Athanasian believe, that the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty, and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty!—while Dr. Burnet and his followers maintain, that the Son and the Holy Ghost are created beings, and are Gods only by the indwelling with the Father's Godhead. Let Bishop Horsley and his admirers contend, that the Father produced the Son by contemplating his own perfections, and refuse to assign a reason why he produced no more than one! Let Bishop Gastrell and Dr. Moysey believe, *if they can*, that the *Father* 'includes the whole idea of God, and *something more;*' that the *Son* 'includes the whole idea of God, and *something more;*' and that the *Holy Ghost* 'includes the whole idea of God, and *something more;*' while, all together, they make up one complete God, and *nothing more!* And let Bishop Burgess, on the contrary, believe, *if it be possible*, that the *Father* is a *person*, but 'not a being;' the *Son* is a *person*, but '*not a being;*' and the *Holy Ghost* is a *person*, but '*not a being;*' and that these three personal nonentities make *one perfect Being!* Let Mr. Heber maintain, if he pleases, the extraordinary position, that the Father is the first person in the Trinity, the Archangel Michael the second, and the Angel Gabriel the third!—let all these gentlemen, and their numerous adherents, enjoy their respective opinions with the most unrestrained freedom—let them profess their principles as publicly as they please, and let them propagate these doctrines with zeal proportioned to their apprehended importance; but let them, at the same time, beware not to exceed their just limits—let them not invade the rights of their neighbour—let them not set themselves up as lords over other men's consciences—let them not presume to erect the little shibboleth of their own party as the test of evangelical truth—let them not usurp the authority of Christ, and reject those who acknowledge him as their Master and Head, and who yield a ready and unfeigned assent to whatever doctrine it is proved that he has taught, but who assume to themselves that liberty of judgment which they concede to others, and who cannot see the evidence of many opinions, which pass currently for the peculiarities of the Gospel, and upon which many are disposed to lay the greatest stress.

Besides the authorities which I have now quoted, to prove the *want of uniformity* of faith among those who have subscribed the same human tests, I must acknowledge, Sir, that I am ashamed to notice the strange, paradoxical, and contradictory arguments that have been advanced by different orthodox members, against Arians, Socinians, and Unitarians. I must assert, and I do it with humility and charity, that they are utterly unacquainted with the systems to which they have referred. In Dr. Evans' well-known sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World, under the article on Arianism, it is stated, "Arius owned Christ to be God in a subordinate sense, and considered his death to be a propitiation for sin. The Arians acknowledge that the Son was the *Word*, though they deny its being eternal; contending, that it had only been created prior to all other beings. Christ, say they, had nothing of man in him, except the flesh, with which the Logos, or Word, spoken of by the Apostle John, was united, which supplied the rest. The Arians, though they deny that Christ is the *eternal God*, yet they contend against others for his *pre-existence*. His pre-existence they found on the two following

passages, among many others: '*Before* Abraham was, I am;'—and the prayer of Jesus—'Glorify me with that glory, which I had with thee, *before* the world began.' These, and other texts of a similar kind, are, in their opinion, irrefragable proofs that Christ did actually exist in another state before he was born of the Virgin Mary, in the land of Judea." But without longer detaining you on this point, one of our brethren, notwithstanding their boasted uniformity, says, we are Atheists—that is, having no God; another says, we are Deists—that is, having a God; and, however unaccountable it may be, Mr. Elder, whose age obliges me to respect him, has said, we are both Deists and Atheists,—that is, having at the same time, a God, and no God! One orthodox member says, we deny Christ; another says, we believe in Christ: the former says, that we rest for salvation upon the merit of our own good works, though he should know, that, without exception, we trust for salvation to the free, unpurchased mercy of Almighty God, as revealed in his Word. The latter charges us with denying good works, though he should remember that *disgraces and degradations have been confined to his orthodox brethren.*—(Order, order.) Yes, *confined* to his Trinitarian friends. To crown the uniformity, an aged member has, in his own peculiar manner, called us infidels, though he expects to meet us in heaven! I must again, Sir, mourn, and lament, and deplore, that men, professing Christianity—that Ministers of the Gospel, and who have had opportunities for obtaining information, should expose themselves by making such rash and erroneous statements. This moment, one, judging by the inhabitants of our bleak mountains and sequestered glens, tells us, that we are decreasing!—the next, another, judging by the 500 Unitarian congregations of England, and the 1000 of America, and which have been erected in less than 50 years, talks of danger, with alarm! I tell these gentlemen, that were all the Arians and Unitarians of this Island flung to the north star, they cannot prevent men from judging for themselves. Mr. John Brown has had recourse to arithmetic, as an argument in favour of his cause; and, if he wish, according to his own observations, to be influenced by numbers, he should pass from Presbyterianism into the Church of England, and from that into the Church of Rome—where he may add the Virgin Mary to the number of his Gods. It is more than marvellous, that he should have recourse to the argument, of numbers being on his side, when he must be aware, that the history of science, and the history of religion, puts this claim of the majority to the blush, and shows that the propagation of Christianity was the work of *individual minds*, in opposition to the will and wishes of the *multitude*;—that Copernicus and Gallileo advanced philosophy, under a persecution which was popular;—and that Luther, and Calvin, and Zuinglius, brought on the Reformation, when opposed by the great mass of the people. Even the hatred of one Trinitarian Church to another, has been pressed forward as an evidence and a seal, to prove the truth of the Trinity! And, I must say, if railing will pass for criticism, reproach for argument, and contradictions for proof, that to these gentlemen I freely yield the victory. *They* may appeal to the public feeling; *we* appeal not from Festus to Cæsar, but from man to God. And, I add, that *I have, in some measure, been confirmed in my present views, by the immoralities of Trinitarians*, and rejoice in having brought persons to the table of Christ, who were driven almost into unbelief, by the crimes and creeds of the Orthodox. What now, Sir, shall be said of this boasted uniformity? On my right hand, I see Calvinists with their five points; on my left, I see Arminians with their opposite five points—and claiming, on both sides, the names Orthodox and Evangelical! Nay, more—much more: they all lay claim to the influence of the Holy Spirit! Were not this a mere pretence, we should have a sure and safe guide to uniformity. But one orthodox spirit is frequently at variance with another orthodox spirit,

though both the spirits pretend to be of God! They may pretend what they please; but as for us, we must return to Moses in the Law, and to Christ in the Gospel. Personal piety is mentioned in the amended overture, and is, undoubtedly, of great moment. But to those who wish to encourage it in others, I would respectfully remark, that humility is the first lesson which we learn from diligent reflection, and self-distrust the first proof we give of having obtained a knowledge of ourselves. I could speak many hours on the question before the house, but am aware that your time is too precious to claim such indulgence. I invite, however, any of my orthodox brethren, to meet me with his Bible in his hand, and discuss with me the important points at issue.

Mr. *Montgomery* then rose, and spoke to the following effect:—Moderator, two circumstances render it difficult for me to arrange and conduct my arguments upon the important question now before you, in the manner which I could desire: the first, is, the difficulty of catching and reducing into order the desultory reasonings of my opponents; and the second, that many of the remarks which I intended to introduce, have been anticipated by those on my own side of the house. I shall, however, proceed with as much regularity as circumstances permit, and fearlessly lay before you my sentiments, upon a subject, involving not merely the character and stability of this Church, but likewise the interests and influence of Christianity itself.

I shall set out upon a principle, which I consider to be unassailable, *viz.* that religion is entirely a matter between man and his Creator, excepting so far as one human being may lawfully endeavour to influence another by friendly counsel and instruction. Farther than this, no earthly power has a right to extend: to one Master alone, all are accountable: and as no man can stand in my place, to answer for my principles and conduct before the tribunal of my Judge, I shall never regulate my views of Divine Truth by the opinions of fallible mortals, nor permit them to interfere with that faith, which is to direct my conduct, and to hallow my heart. For instruction, if I be in error, I would be grateful; with courteous admonition, I would not be offended; but to authoritative decisions, I never shall submit,—for I should thereby renounce the unalterable allegiance which I owe to the sole King and Head of the Church.

It has been said, that "Arians hold that there is *nothing essential* in Christianity." If this assertion has been made in ignorance, I pity the persons that have used it; if in wickedness, and with a deliberate purpose of misrepresentation, I hope that I can forgive them. I am bound, however, to say, that it has not a shadow of foundation in truth. So far from alleging that there is *nothing* essential in Christianity, we distinctly hold *every thing* to be essential which God has been pleased to reveal. But I shall tell you what we do say:—that those doctrines, concerning which there have been interminable and bitter controversies amongst Christians, *cannot be the Fundamentals of Religion*. We rest this opinion upon the most profound veneration for the all-perfect and adorable character of the Supreme Being. We believe, that, in all things, he can adapt the means which he employs to the ends which he desires to promote: we feel satisfied, that he could have no difficulty in suiting the language of his Revelation to the capacities of those for whose benefit it was communicated: and we necessarily infer, that no principle can be fundamental which is not explicitly revealed. I would put it to my opponents, to say, what conception *they* must form of the justice and benignity of God, who aver that he has left matters essential to the salvation of his creatures, in such a woful state of uncertainty, that scarcely two men can agree in their explanation of them? Would not this be, to impeach both the wisdom and goodness of the Deity, and to render him accessary to the destruction of his people? And that the Doctrine of the Trinity is one of a very doubtful character, I can

easily prove from the variety of opinions entertained upon the subject, even by the Orthodox themselves. The copious extracts read by my friend, Mr. Blakeley, from the works of the most eminent divines of the Established Church, amply testify, that amongst them there is no unity of sentiment; and in a volume lately published, by one of the most intelligent members of this Synod, the doctrine of the Trinity is freely admitted "to be a doctrine of *inference*, and not of *explicit revelation*." Mr. Carlile was too ingenuous to contend for triumph instead of truth; and he has candidly admitted, what a determined controversialist would have kept out of view. Whilst we hear on all sides, in this house, that the Trinity is *the* fundamental doctrine of Christianity, he freely admits "that he would not place a doctrine of inference upon an equality with one of explicit revelation." With him, therefore, there must be other doctrines of superior importance; for, certainly, there are many expressly revealed. But in the conduct of the orthodox members of this Synod, last year, at Strabane, we have an irresistible proof, that they were not agreed amongst themselves, regarding their assumed fundamental principle. After disputing for hours about *substance*, and *essence*, and *person*, they were at length compelled to adopt a sentence from the Shorter Catechism, about the terms of which no two of them agreed: and when the whole affair was over, one of them very gravely said to another, "*your* orthodoxy is not *my* orthodoxy!" Yet, in the face of all these facts, Mr. Elder had, yesterday, the hardihood to assert, "that no man could read a chapter in the Bible without seeing the doctrine of the Trinity clearly revealed!" If the matter be so *very* clear, is it not strange, that he did not point out to his brethren the mode of expressing the doctrine in the *language of Scripture?* Such a step would have been courteous to them, and charitable to us—for, in that case, we would have cordially joined in their declaration.

That the doctrine of the Trinity may be one, which, as Mr. John Brown asserts, the most ignorant persons can most easily embrace, I do not pretend to deny. Presumption is a natural consequence of ignorance. Vanity of heart, unchastened by accuracy of judgment, has led to the most arrogant assumptions. It is not when men are illuminated by the spirit of Divine truth, that they presumptuously dictate creeds to their brethren, but when they are blinded by their own prejudices and passions. The wise and the enlightened are always distrustful of their own judgments; whilst the weak and the uninstructed are almost universally positive and dogmatical.

The fact is, it was this ignorant vanity of man which first led to human interference in matters of faith, obscured the lustre of Divine truth, and paved the way for all subsequent corruptions. In the Apostolic ages, when there was no creed but that which came from on high, when there was no interference with opinions save "the counsels of love," Christianity went forth in its native purity and simplicity, captivating the hearts, and adorning the lives of men. But, the moment that earth attempted to patronise the religion of Heaven—the moment that the Empire of Rome took Christianity under its protection—that moment corruptions commenced, "the fine gold became dim." Priests and governors dictated modes of faith and forms of worship; and, in order to sanction the assumption, laid claim to infallibility, in determining the counsels of Heaven. Under this pretence arose a power more extensive and more terrible than any that ever influenced the destinies of the world—a power that equally held in thraldom the cottage and the palace—that almost extinguished the light of literature and science—that took away much of the genuine substance of religion, and left but shadowy forms and ceremonies in its room. The argument, of the *majority* having a right to coerce the *minority*, was urged with equal justice then, as it is now;

might constituted *right*, whilst racks, and dungeons, and flames, confirmed her decisions, and preserved uniformity.

Upon what principle was it first attempted to change this scene of things? Why, upon the simple, and rational, and scriptural principle, that every man has an inalienable right to take up his Bible, and to form his own conclusions regarding the things which belong to his duty here, and his prospects hereafter. Upon this immutable principle, the Reformation commenced; and happy would it have been for the world, had it continued as it began. But, alas! the leaven of Popery has been more or less infused into every Church. No sooner did Protestants acquire power, than they began to trench upon Christian liberty: they wrested the scourge from the Church of Rome, in order to apply it to the backs of their brethren: they wrote creeds, appointed ceremonies, and connected civil interests with religious professions, until every division of the Protestant Church exhibited a miniature of the great Establishment from which it had dissented. The right of private judgement, indeed, was still talked of, and even praised, as I have heard done in this house, by those that are treading it in the dust; but with such persons, it consisted then, as it does now, in exercising the right to judge both for *themselves* and for *others*. To assist Mr. Morell, and those who glory in the licentiousness with which you trample upon your own laws, I shall quote a passage from the *Code of Discipline*, to enable the world to form some judgment of the distinguished discrepancy which exists between your principles and your practice. "The power possessed by the teachers of the Church, amounts to no more than this, to search the mind of the Spirit speaking in the Scriptures, and to produce Scriptural authority for what they teach. It is the privilege, the right, and the duty of every man to examine the Scriptures for himself: but in exercising the inalienable right of his own judgment, the Christian does not refuse to admit light, or to receive assistance from his teachers: he only refuses to acknowledge subjection to any authority but the Word of God; and before he assent to any doctrine, he claims the right of examining the Scriptures for himself, that upon their authority he may rest fully persuaded in his own mind." Holding out these incontrovertible principles, you claim the praise of liberality, "you keep the word of promise to the ear;" but, acting in direct opposition to them, "you break it to the hope." You may speak of the Church of Rome as you will, but in comparison with you, she is honourable and consistent. She claims infallibility, and consequently denies the right of private judgment; but with a monstrous inconsistency, you admit your fallibility, whilst you demand a submission, which nothing could authorise you to claim, but an absolute freedom from the very possibility of error. I do ask, in sober sadness, how any class of Protestants can acquit themselves to their own consciences and the world, who assert that their brethren have a right to search the Sacred Records, and to deduce from them their own conclusions, whilst at the very same moment, they endeavour to curtail their privileges, and to put them to serious inconvenience for the mere exercise of their natural and Christian rights?

I do aver, that your whole Overture is directly opposed to the first principles of the Reformation—the right of free inquiry, without penalty or privation. Should it be passed into a law, not a single Student can be educated, or licensed to preach, without risk of injury, and submission to human authority in matters of faith. If you persevere in this measure, you should change the whole system of education for your candidates. Instead of prescribing, as at present, an extensive course of ancient and modern literature, previous to their entering College, and several years' study of philosophy and science, subsequently to their entrance, in order to enlarge their views and increase their capacity for forming accurate judgments, you should limit their education and cramp

their understandings, lest they be led to incur penalties by venturing to think for themselves. And when they enter the Theological Class, instead of directing their attention to the *Bible*, as the rule of their faith, and the anchor of their hopes, your Professor should advise them to study nothing but "the accredited standards of the Orthodox Churches," by which their competency for teaching is eventually to be determined! Besides all this, he ought studiously to conceal from their view, the progress of Christianity, and the various sects that have arisen in the Church, lest some heresy, such as Arianism, should appear to their minds as rational and as scriptural as Calvinism itself! This would be the honest and manly course to pursue. No false ray of light would shoot across their minds, from too free an inquiry into the meaning of the Scriptures; they would be taught to build their faith upon the *safe* foundation of the "Accredited Standards," and in all things they would be well prepared for due submission to their spiritual guides! But to enlarge and disenthral their minds, as you do at present, by literature, philosophy, and science—to tell them, that the Bible, and "the Bible ALONE is the religion of Protestants"—that they are bound to study it, and have a right to form their own opinions of its doctrines—to do all this, and much more, to produce a manly and independent mode of thinking, and then to turn round upon them in the end, and to expel them from your Church, if all their views do not precisely accord with yours,—to act in this manner, is surely equally tyrannical and unjust. Their time, their toil, their means of support—all are lost, because you have taught them to *think*, and they have chanced to think differently from you!

These Overtures, however, would not only impose a virtual subscription to human interpretations of Scripture, which may, or may not, be agreeable to the Word of God, but they would impose this submission to man's authority, in a form more objectionable than was ever proposed in the darkest ages of the Church. Were a candidate for the Ministry obliged to subscribe the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, or *The Confession of Faith*, he would, at least, be able to make up his mind, and to ascertain the full extent of the sacrifice required of him: but in coming before your projected Committee for license, he would be subjected to an ordeal for which no human being could make due preparation. He would be exposed to the caprice of a many-headed monster—having as many opinions as members—all living in jealousy and collision with each other. No matter into what pliancy he might school his conscience, it would be almost impossible for him to escape. He might as well sail between Scylla and Charybdis, as hope at once to please Mr. Johnston, the smooth Arminian, and that staunch Calvinist, Dr. Wright. Whilst attempting to gain favour with the one, he would require to cast a side-long glance at the other; and also to watch the various minor movements of the extraordinary beings, to whose humours his destiny in life must be in a great measure subjected! But, bad as this is, it is not the worst. This strange compound will necessarily change its features every year; so that, at one time, the majority of its faces may wear the stern, unbending, lineaments of Calvinism, and at another, the softer looks of liberal Arminianism. I am not much inclined to submit to human authority; but were I compelled to do so, I should much prefer placing myself under the power of the Pope, to coming under the control of your projected Committee. I might study the character, and accommodate myself, in due time, to the caprices of an individual; but to the ever-changing medley of passions, and prejudices, and opinions, of which your Committee must necessarily be composed, no man could ever be conformed. The only consolation which I enjoy in contemplating this ecclesiastical monster, is, that as it is not similar to any thing that ever existed in air, or earth, or sea, I am fully convinced, that in its own turbid and jarring elements, it will carry the seeds of its dissolution, and speedily pass away from the world.

One argument much relied upon by our opponents, is, that every society has a right to make laws for the government of its own members, and for the admission of others to its privileges. There is some plausibility, but no solidity in this. No society has any right to make a subsequent law in violation of a previous compact. Now, the projected overture would be a direct infringement of those liberal regulations under which we entered the Synod of Ulster; and if you take from us any power or privilege which we then enjoyed, you are guilty of a gross breach of faith. So much for your power of making laws affecting those already in your body; and now a few words respecting those who claim admission. On this point, I assert that you have no power to make any laws, but such as are in accordance with the clear and express Word of God. The Lord Jesus Christ is the King of his Church, the Bible is its Constitution, and we are subjects bound to obey the laws of his kingdom. Our sole business, therefore, is to regulate our conduct by the laws contained in the Statute Book; for it is evident, that we have no right to alter any law, either to benefit ourselves, or to injure others. Upon this principle, I shall amply prove, that you have no right to refuse admission to any individual of sufficient attainments and irreproachable life, who holds such religious opinions as I entertain. "To the Law and to the Testimony," I bring the matter for trial; and I refer you to the Acts of the Apostles, chapter viii. and verse 37. You will there find, the terms on which the Ethiopian was admitted to baptism by the Apostle Philip:—"And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest be baptized; and he answered and said, *I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God:* and Philip baptized him." Now, does not every Arian believe this with all his heart, and will you dare to refuse admission into the Synod of Ulster, to men who would have been admitted to the holy ordinance of baptism, by an inspired follower of the Lord? I refer you, farther, to the 1st Epistle of John, chap. iv. where you will find explained the manner in which we are to *try* the spirits of men:—"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they be of God. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that *Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*, is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God: and this is that spirit of Antichrist whereof ye have heard, that it should come into the world." But where is the Arian who does not most joyfully and most gratefully confess, that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh? Yet, in direct opposition to God's Word, and to their own knowledge, some of our brethren have had the hardihood to brand us in a public Journal, with the appellation of "Anti-Christs, and Men of Sin!" I now call upon those Ministers and that Journal, to retract the groundless calumny, which they have circulated against men, to say the least, as respectable and as Christian as themselves. I shall only refer to one passage more (though I might easily multiply quotations), to prove, that, according to Scripture, we are entitled to the same privileges as any other members of this Church. The passage, is, 1 John iv. 15, "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God." Could language be stronger than this? And yet, although holding my opinions—solemnly *confessing that Jesus is the Son of God*—the Spirit of God may dwell in me, to enlighten my understanding, and sanctify my heart, Mr. Elder and Mr. Dill have the modesty and good feeling to allege, that I am not holy enough to associate with *them!* I put it to you, "Fathers and brethren," is it honest, is it seemly, is it Christian in you, to prescribe stricter terms of communion, than those appointed by the Spirit of God; or to put men to inconvenience for maintaining opinions which would have gained them free admission into the Churches of the Apostles?

But it has been asked by Mr. Morell, "where shall we stop? shall we

admit all professing Christians, Socinians, Catholics, &c.?" I answer, We should just stop with our guide—with the Holy Scriptures. If we go one step farther, we will be involved in the mazes of conjecture; and, endeavouring "to become wise above what is written," we shall be lost in endless perplexity and doubt. Upon this ground, I would refuse to hold communion with those Churches, that have "decreed rites and ceremonies" not prescribed in the Word of God; because these are "the inventions of men," and I know that woe is denounced upon those who add to the Scriptures, or detract from them. To show that my opinions, on this subject, are countenanced by eminent authority, I shall give a short extract from two distinguished writers. In proposing to do this, I know that I shall subject myself to the sneer and cant of modern times, which would represent learning and talent as incompatible with a knowledge of Divine truth. In one of those miserable inflammatory productions, with which the country is inundated at present, the author says, "he would value the opinions of Milton, Newton, and Locke, no more than that of *three idiots!*" I do not envy the intellect, which, puffed up by overweening vanity, could undervalue the opinions of a Newton, whose gigantic mind unfolded the laws of Nature; or those of a Locke, who explored the mysteries of the human understanding with unrivalled skill and power. I would not, however, idolize intelligence, though I would profit by its assistance, just as I would read a Commentary to assist me in understanding an obscure text. The first of the authors from whom I shall read a short passage, is the illustrious Chillingworth—a name dear to Protestantism, and to Truth. "It is this presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the words of God, the special senses of men upon the general words of God (and laying them upon men's consciences together, under the equal penalty of death and damnation)—this vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God—*this deifying our own interpretations*, and enforcing them upon others—this restraining of the words of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty, wherein Christ and his Apostles left them,—which is, and hath been the only fountain of all the schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal; the common incendiary of Christendom, and that which tears into pieces, not the coat, but the bowels and members of Christ; (*ridente Turca nec dolente Judæo.* Take away this persecuting, cursing, and damning, of men, for not subscribing to the *words of men*, as the words of God;) require of Christians only to believe Christ, and to call no man master but him only; let those leave claiming infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that *in their words disclaim it*, disclaim it likewise in their actions,—take away, I say, this tyranny, and restore Christians to their just and full liberty of captivating their understanding to Scripture only; and as rivers, when they have a free passage, run all to the ocean, so it may well be hoped, by God's blessing, that universal liberty thus moderated, may quickly reduce Christendom to truth and UNITY."

To the same purpose we find the opinion of Locke:—"But if they say that the articles which they require to be professed, are consequences *deduced* from Scripture, it is, undoubtedly, well done of them who believe and profess such things as seem unto them so agreeable to the rule of faith. But it would be very ill done to obtrude those things *upon others*, unto whom they do *not* seem to be the indubitable doctrines of the Scripture. And to make a separation for such things as these, which neither are, nor *can* be, fundamental, is to become *heretics*. For I do not think there is any man arrived to that degree of *madness*, as that he dare give out his consequences and *interpretations* of Scripture, as divine inspirations, and compare the articles of faith that he has framed according to his own fancy, with the authority of Scripture."

Yet this madness, which Locke thought scarcely possible, is now looked upon by many, as the perfection of human wisdom.

Mr. Barnett has inquired, in the language of Scripture, "how can two walk together, except they be agreed?" I would just ask him, "agreed in what?" is it in faith, in all the shades of doctrinal opinions, and in all their views of Church Government? If this be his interpretation of the text, I would advise him instantly to leave that orthodox seat in which he is now sitting, for there is not in it a single man, who, in all points, agrees with him, nor probably any two, that agree with each other. Surely, then, the agreement required, cannot be Mr. Barnett's visionary one, but a real, practicable unity—a unity of kind affections and forbearance—a unity of design, to promote the glory of God and the salvation of sinners. I admit, however, that there is a very powerful bond of union amongst our opponents, in one sense. They have agreed to lay aside all their own points of disputation for a season, and to concentrate their forces for a joint effort against the unfortunate Arians. Dr. Wright, although he says "it cuts him to the heart, to think that there is an Arminian in this Synod," nevertheless joins "hand in hand" with Mr. Johnston, and other known Arminians, to make war upon the common enemy. This shows great prudence. The Goths and Vandals of old united in overrunning Italy, and when they had accomplished their primary design, they fought with each other for the spoil. So will it be with you: when you have subdued us, you can turn your arms against one another, to prevent them from rusting through inaction; and, in the end, we may have many divisions.

There is one consideration which I would most earnestly and solemnly press upon you, my brethren, on the opposite side; and I think, I shall not press it in vain. You all admit, that you are fallible and sinful as individuals; and you admit, that no possible combination of fallibles could make an infallible: for although in chemistry, amalgamation frequently changes the nature of substances, yet in Church Courts, I believe it will be found, that the mass will partake of the same properties as the different ingredients which compose it. Is it not then possible, with all your confidence in the soundness of your own conclusions, that you *may be wrong;* that you may, at this moment, be giving all the weight of your influence to perpetuate *error*; and that "haply you may be fighting against God," at whose tribunal you will one day be answerable for the measures which you are now taking to arrest the progress of truth? If this be *possible*, if, from the nature of man, it be exceedingly *probable*, I do beseech you, for your own sakes and ours, to follow the advice of Gamaliel: "Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this work and this counsel be of men, it will come to nought, but if it be of God, you cannot prevail against it." It sounds very well to talk of "supporting the cause of God and truth:" but you should remember, that this is taking for granted the very subject of dispute, *viz.* whether truth really be on your side. If it be, God will sustain his own cause, without such violent efforts on your parts. The mole that raised a hillock to support a fortress, was less presumptuous than men, when they speak familiarly of protecting the cause of Heaven. I entreat you rather to attend to the great Christian principle, "of doing unto others as you would that they should do unto you." Now, suppose that at this moment, the majority of this Synod were Arians, and that the tide of popular feeling was flowing as strongly in their favour, as it is now doing in yours, I ask, would these circumstances convince you that you were in error? No such thing; you would be then as satisfied of the truth of your opinions as you are at this moment. How, then, would you feel, were we to take such steps as you are now pursuing, to eradicate your opinions, to fill your pulpits with Arian ministers, to expose conscientious Calvinists to inconvenience, and to prevent any orthodox young man

from receiving license to preach? Would not the whole kingdom resound with the voice of your just complaint and indignation? All we ask, then, is even-hand justice; let our opinions have fair play; let young men be licensed with their true characters, and let the people choose or reject them as they think it right.

There is nothing more remarkable, than the direct opposition which often exists between the words and the actions of men. This contrast is peculiarly manifested in religion. The right of private judgment, is a pleasing and fertile theme at controversial meetings, and at Bible Societies, where all sects meet together, as they ought to do. But, let the declaimers come into another situation, and the very right which they so strenuously pressed upon Catholics, they will deny to Protestants; and the Bible which they put into men's hands, without note or comment, they will declare to be inadequate to lead them to salvation, unless they adopt their views of its doctrines! In the same manner, they speak most humbly of themselves, declaim about the weakness and fallibility of man, and then act in a way which nothing but immediate inspiration could justify! I have been led to these observations, by a statement of Mr. Barnett, who said that he would admit no man to the Lord's Table, that did not think as *he* did, on doctrinal subjects. I never heard any sentiment with more pain. If Mr. Barnet be, as he will freely admit that he is, a fallible and sinful man, I would seriously ask him, how he dares to stand between any man and his Redeemer, and to render his opinions the standard, by which to measure all who desire to become "soldiers of the Cross?" It may be, in this uncertain world, that an individual rejected for no moral offence, but simply for supposed error of opinion, should never have another opportunity of testifying his faith and his love, by a devout communion: and I do appeal to Mr. B., whether he can altogether enjoy the approbation of his own mind, in reflecting, that he has prevented an individual so circumstanced, from strengthening his hope, confirming his repentance, and, perhaps, closing his eyes in peace?

Mr. Cooke says, that "we should all wear the same livery!" Now, I hate livery, because it is a badge of subjection to man. The livery of sects creates as much disturbance, as the livery of parties. And, after all, outward conformity by no means implies internal resemblance. Even externally, however, Mr. Cooke's friends will wear but a motley aspect: the collar, and perhaps the sleeves of their livery may be the same, but the body and the skirts will be as patched and diversified as the pantaloons of harlequin. Stern Calvinism, moderate Calvinism, Arianism, and many fainter shades of difference, never can present a uniform appearance. Variety, indeed, is the immutable law of Nature. If we cast our eyes over this fair earth which we inhabit, how beautifully is it diversified with hill and dale, with lakes and plains, with oceans and continents, with woods and rivers, with the wildness of nature, and the richness of cultivation! In all the extended surface presented to the eye, we cannot find two trees, two animals, nor even two blades of grass exactly alike. And if we turn to the beautiful canopy of heaven, we perceive that "one star differeth from another star in glory." When I look around upon this assembly, and contemplate "the human face divine," I see the same principle amply recognised in the infinite diversity of feature, expression, and intelligence, presented to my view. And, could I penetrate the hearts, and enter the secret recesses of the minds by which I am surrounded, what an endless variety of emotions, and passions, and opinions, would I behold! To attempt, therefore, by human legislation, to produce an absolute agreement in religious sentiments, would be to rise in rebellion against Nature, and, consequently, against "Nature's God." Wherever such attempts have been made, and just in proportion as they have succeeded, the beauty and the power of religion have declined. In turning the eye back upon the course of time,

what a deep and melancholy gloom broods over those ages, in which the power of man imposed creeds and confessions, and daringly interfered with the prerogatives of Heaven! The state of our Church, before our late contentions, has been compared to the Dead Sea. The comparison will not stand examination. There was no deadness or stagnation amongst us: there was diversity of mind, but unity of heart; there was an honourable maintenance of our own opinions, and an equally creditable forbearance with regard to the conscientious convictions of others; we met, and parted, like men and Christians. But, if the proposed measures could succeed, then there would, indeed, be a dead sea of Presbyterianism: inquiry would cease; the salutary agitation of conflicting opinions would be done away; and one unnatural and unwholesome calm would reign over the whole extent of your Church. But I rejoice in the certainty, that this cannot be; there are conflicting elements amongst yourselves; and the various sects with which you are intermingled, will not permit you to stagnate in heartless inactivity.

The proposed measures are eminently calculated to violate the rights of the people. You tell them, that the privilege of choosing their own pastors, is one of the greatest which men can enjoy; but should your Overture pass into a law, this privilege will be only a name. Whatever may be their views of Gospel truth, you will permit them to elect no Pastor but one that has been measured by the standard of Faith erected by your Committee! But they may obtain a Minister, you say, from the Presbytery of Antrim, or from England. Very true: but will you ordain him? By no means. Then must they lose their bounty, to which, as contributors to the general revenue of the country, they are fairly entitled; and their Ministers must be excluded from the important advantages of the Widows' Fund. Now, is it not a monstrous inconsistency, to tell the people that they have a right to choose their Teachers, aad then to inflict upon them a pecuniary mulct, for the conscientious exercise of their privileges? I appeal to the representatives of the Laity, who have come hither to assist in the passing of laws for the curtailment of our liberties, whether they may not be forging heavy fetters for themselves and their children? That they have an unquestionable right to judge for themselves "in the things pertaining to their own salvation," I most cheerfully admit; but I do put it to their modesty, their discretion, and their Christian feeling, whether as unlettered men (which they generally are), and educated under the influence of strange prejudices, they should attempt to force their opinions upon Ministers of the Gospel, who have spent a long series of years in education, and reading, and study of the Scriptures, to qualify them for the proper discharge of the duties of their important, and awfully responsible situations? I greatly mistake the honest and manly character of the Presbyterian Laity, if this appeal shall be made to the Elders without effect.

I come now to a very painful, but necessary part of my duty, namely, to refute the calumnies uttered against our opinions, by Mr. Elder and others in this house; and which have been most industriously circulated in the world. We have been directly charged with being "no Christians." We shall not fling back the uncharitable denunciation upon our accusers, though we might remind them, "that if any man have not the spirit of Christ" (the spirit of charity and love), "he is none of his." We appeal from the harsh and prejudiced judgment of our fellow-sinners, to the justice of that God whom we adore, and to the benignity of that exalted Saviour, who is the anchor of all our hopes, and who knows that we love him in sincerity and truth. "It is a light thing for us to be judged by man's judgment," for we know, "that so long as our hearts condemn us not, we may have confidence towards God." To our unjust accusers, we would only say, "Judge not, that ye be not judged, for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself." It has been

said, "that we must look upon our opponents as idolaters." God forbid. We brand none with odious epithets, on account of their conscientious belief: we do not consider them idolaters. We believe that they worship as we do, "the one God and Father of all;" and that, in their own minds, they have some way of reconciling the worship of the Trinity with the first great principle of Revelation—*the absolute Unity of God.* I have heard nothing but Arian prayers since I came to this Synod, nor, indeed, at any other time. In your devotional exercises, the three Great Beings, engaged in the gracious work of salvation, are uniformly kept distinct, save at the very conclusion, and as I know that "none can find out the Almighty unto perfection," I shall never accuse any man of being an idolater, because he does not exactly entertain my views of the Divine nature and perfections. Let others judge me as they will, "I judge no man."

The inconsistency and absurdity of another charge preferred against us, namely, that we are both *Atheists and Deists* at the same time, has been powerfully exposed by my friend, Mr. Blakeley. No man acquainted with the meaning of words, could seriously bring forward such an accusation; but the object being to inflame the multitude, Atheists and Deists will produce as much mysterious horror, as any other terms which they do not understand. It is melancholy, however, to think that Christian Ministers should submit to such arts; for surely the cause of truth cannot be promoted by deliberate misrepresentation; neither is "it lawful to do evil, that good may come."

But, according to Mr. Elder, "we deny the Lord that bought us," and, consequently, are exposed to the penalty of "bringing upon ourselves swift destruction!" Such a shocking and unfounded imputation, only reflects disgrace upon its author. We know too well the forfeiture attached to denying our Redeemer, to be guilty of such base ingratitude and folly. We know, "that if any deny Him before men, them will he deny before his Heavenly Father." We know, "that there is none other name under Heaven, given amongst men, whereby we can be saved, than that of Christ Jesus." We look up to him with unbounded gratitude, as "the new and living way, by which alone there is access to the Father." He is the hope of our salvation as well as of yours. I can say, with as much sincerity as any man in this house,

"Jesus, my Lord, I know his name,
His name is all my boast;
Nor will he put my soul to shame,
Nor let my hopes be lost."

Is this "robbing the Saviour of his crown of glory?" Is this "denying the Lord that bought us?" I am almost ashamed to feel indignation against slanders which only merit contempt.

But it seems "we trust for salvation to our own good works!" Where Mr. Elder learned this, I cannot conjecture; but, perhaps, his acquaintance with New-light Ministers is more extensive than mine. This, however, I do say, that I never knew any man arrogant enough, or rather mad enough, to claim salvation of God, as due to his own merits. Alas! Sir, no man can look into his own heart, or trace back the turbid course of his own life, without being deeply sensible that he cannot stand upon his own righteousness in the presence of that infinitely Holy Being, "who chargeth even his angels with folly, and in whose eyes the very heavens are not clean." But, I shall tell you what we do say: we maintain, that principles are only valuable in so far as they lead to practice; and that faith is important only as the forerunner of works. We do not consider that religion consists in an empty name—in a vain and self-righteous profession—in the use of technical theological terms—or in despising others; but in the discharge of the great duties of piety and morality, by which we honour God and benefit mankind. We

believe, that *faith* without *works* is of no more advantage to the individual possessing it, than the gold of the miser in his coffers, or a mine of wealth in the centre of the globe. Nay, more: we believe that the faith of the Christian, which leads not to virtuous practice, is not merely *useless*, but *destructive;* inasmuch as its possessor neglects duty, "or sins against the light," and thereby "becomes worse than an infidel." We believe that works are not only the *evidence* of faith, but the very *end and object* of faith; in accordance with the whole tenor of the Gospel, and the clear design of revelation, which are intended "to turn us from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God." We believe, however, that our works must be sanctified by the motives which faith supplies, and that we cannot approve ourselves to God, by either faith or works *singly*, but only by both *united*. In fact, we hold faith, or right principles, to be the foundation—and works, or right practice, to be the superstructure, of the Christian edifice; and yet, that after all we *can* do, we are all "unprofitable servants," and must finally rest upon grace alone.

This leads me to notice the last calumny, which has been uttered against us by Mr. Elder—"that we put our hopes of salvation in a *mere creature!*" Sir, we do nothing of the kind; we rest our hopes of final acceptance with God, neither on our own works, nor upon any mere creature, but upon the unbounded mercy and compassion of our Heavenly Father, as revealed unto us, in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. I trust to the candour and honesty of Mr. Elder and his friends, that they will now retract their calumnies, and endeavour to disabuse the minds of their people, by acknowledging their errors and misrepresentations.

Had we escaped with the groundless invective of *plain prose*, we might have considered ourselves happy; but, wo is me!—the artillery of the Muses has been brought to play upon us, from the heights of Parnassus; and we are likely "to be damned to everlasting fame," in "immortal verse!" A Poem, entitled "*The Thinking Few*," has just burst upon the delighted world. I do not know whether it may most properly be called lyric, epic, or tragic—perhaps it is rather a combination of the beauties of all the three! Of one thing, however, there can be no doubt, the subject is admirable—for I, myself, am the hero! This precious production, which attacks the right of private judgment, with the utmost virulence, through many pages, surely cannot be *the offspring of an Orthodox Presbyterian Minister*, as is generally asserted!!! From the beginning of the world, until the present time, every villain that has disgraced humanity, is represented as having been an Arian! The author should have gone just one step farther back (as, I understand, he did in a sermon), and represented the *Father of lies* as the first Arian! He has, however, commenced with *Cain*, who, it seems, was a staunch Arian, and traced the doctrine through every murderer, suicide, robber, and infidel, down to Carlisle and Taylor! The majesty of the verse is well suited to the dignity of the subject; the variety of the phraseology is only equalled by the copiousness of the thoughts. In as many pages, we find this beautiful stanza *three* times repeated:—

> "For in their minds there is a lodgment
> Of all the right of private judgment!"

Were it not that time is precious, I could read you the whole work with pleasure. Where all is so unique, and so perfect in its kind, it is difficult to make selections: I must, however, content myself with one passage, which affords a fair specimen of the author's exquisite skill, both in poetry and science:—

> "I will illustrate this position
> By Algebraic definition—
> A Deist is an Arian Theist;
> An Arian is a well-cloak'd Deist;

And every *thinking* Arian Theist
Is just—a Unitarian Deist!
Hence, if you take away the cloak,
We have the cuckoo plus the gowk,
And not the leopard minus zebra,
If you do understand Algebra!
Or, if your Euclid be in use,
The square of *Paine's* hypotheneuse
Is equal to a square that's Arian,
And also one that's Unitarian;
And thus it is our northern people
Can measure any Arian steeple!"

I would not have noticed so wretched a production, which is equally devoid of taste, of talent, and of truth, were it not that it manifests the spirit of the times. I know that it was carried, in manuscript, into the houses of persons belonging to a most respectable Arian Minister; and the author, I have good reason to believe, has disgraced both himself and us, by selling it in this very house of worship during our present meeting. I trust, also, that the notice just taken of it, may be the means of raising it to a tenth, or twentieth edition; for I never saw any production so well calculated to injure the cause which it pretends to advocate.

I have been told, that the object of the proposed measures is a friendly one towards us, and designed to prevent a division of this Synod. With some, I believe this to be really the object; but with others, I am persuaded the design is, to render us so uncomfortable as to induce us to retire of our own accord, or to remain with you in a state of degradation. This is not a manly and straight-forward course. Were you to commit an open act of aggression, were you to expel us as heretics, we should retire with the advantage of public sympathy; but, by encouraging us to remain, and to give our countenance to what we consider unscriptural and tyrannical regulations, you would eventually degrade us, both in our own estimation and that of the world. To this, we can never tamely submit; for we know better what is due to our principles and characters. I may here answer the question put by several of you: "Why then do we remain with you, when you so plainly say, you do not like us?" My answer is very simple—We have no dislike to you, although "you have despitefully used us." We consider you to be in great, though not in damnable error; and we are willing to stay with you for a season, in the charitable hope of eventually bringing you round to sound views and scriptural measures. We believe that our opinions are so accordant with right reason and the Word of God, that, in the end, they must triumph over error and prejudice: we hope that "a little leaven may leaven the whole lump;" and we shall remain with you, so long as there is any prospect of success, in order to do you good. But, should our hopes be deceived, and should our consciences tell us that we are wrong to associate with you, I trust we shall know what is due to ourselves and to the cause in which we are engaged.

One thing has struck me powerfully during this debate, namely, that not one of you has maintained the doctrine of exclusive salvation; whilst many of you have cheerfully admitted, that we are respectable men, and that you anticipate the happiness of meeting us in heaven. This is liberal and christian; but do you not see in what an awkward predicament this liberality places you? It seems our principles are adequate to accomplish the ends of religion in this world—to make us pious and virtuous men, and, what is infinitely more important, to prepare us for happiness hereafter. But if so, how can you reconcile it with consistency, to act as if those were unworthy to be members of the Synod of Ulster, who are qualified for "the society of the just made perfect?" The truth is, the

heart often reasons more correctly than the *head;* and I most cordially reciprocate every generous sentiment that has been expressed. I do firmly believe, that through the infinite mercy of God, in his beloved Son, many of us shall meet in a better land, where we shall be astonished at the prejudices, and ashamed of the passions, that have agitated and divided us here.

I do not know that my brethren on the opposite side will give me credit for sincerity, when I say, that, for their own sake, and the reputation of their creed, they ought not to press these measures; but I do honestly assure them, that the proceedings of last year have brought great suspicions upon many, and excited doubts respecting all. When a man professes to believe a creed which is prescribed to him, under the fear of any penalty, or the hope of any advantage, his sincerity is never above suspicion; but if he freely holds certain views of doctrine, without any such inducements, no man can doubt his integrity. Lying under no temptation to hypocrisy, he cannot be accused of deceit: he may be wrong, but he is honest. The moment, however, that a large body of men, infinitely diversified in capacities and attainments, profess to believe in one common standard of faith, that moment doubts and surmisings commence. No one suspects that any member of the Presbytery of Antrim, or of the Independent Church, does not hold the opinions which he professes; but could as much be said for the Catholic Church, the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, or our own Church? It was upon this principle, that the celebrated *Bishop Shipley* advocated, in the House of Lords, the repeal of the disgraceful statute which made it felony to impugn the doctrine of the Trinity. "I am not," said he, "afraid of those tender consciences which scruple subscription, or lead men to profess a scanty creed, for I am convinced they believe what they profess; but I do much fear those men that have an extensive faith—who believe every thing, and subscribe every thing." There never was more practical wisdom, nor a greater knowledge of human nature, displayed in the same number of words; and I can assure you, that it is thus many of the intelligent Laity, just now, think of the Ministers and Licentiates of this Church. When you professed less, you got credit for more.

But a still greater evil has arisen from your past proceedings, and must be increased by your present measures:—I mean, that the preaching of the Gospel has, very generally, been diverted from its legitimate channel. Controversy—controversy—interminable controversy, is the order of the day! Ministers, to remove suspicions from the minds of their people, and to gratify the prevailing taste, are constantly dwelling upon "debateable land," whilst Probationers have no hope of success unless they show themselves powerful in "the strife of words." Even in our own assembly, what has been spoken of since we met—but *opinions!* Not a word about practice—not a syllable about correcting each others' *vices* and *follies,* or reforming the *morals* of our flocks. This is very different from the conduct of "the Great Preacher of Righteousness"—very different from the course prescribed by the orthodox Apostle Paul to his son Titus, when he sent him forth as a Messenger of Grace. He did not exhort him to decry morality, or merely preach it occasionally, as a sort of decent adjunct to abstruse doctrinal harangues. No; he enjoined him to make virtue the sum and substance of his preaching: "These things I will that you affirm *constantly,* that they which believe in God might be careful to maintain *good works:* for these things are good and profitable unto men." No doubt, he preached as every minister ought to do, "Jesus Christ and him crucified," as the foundation of the sinner's hope, and the ground-work of the Christian's holiness; but he never forgot the end of all preaching—the restoring of the sinner "from dead works." How different is the prevalent system of public instruction in these latter days! And how awful is the responsibility of those who turn the attention of the multitude from the duties of life, to the controversies of men!

In answer to all these arguments, for a milder, a more rational, and a more Christian course of procedure, we are told, "that a great ferment exists amongst the people, and that something must be done to allay it." Very true: a great ferment does exist. The prophetic words of our Saviour, who foresaw that the evil passions of men would pervert the benevolent object of his mission, are fully verified—"I come not to send peace upon earth, but a sword." Were that ancient philosopher alive, who, in the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, exclaimed, "Behold how these Christians love one another!" he might now, with equal propriety, ejaculate, "Behold how these Christians hate one another!" But whatever ferment exists, we are not to blame. You kindled the conflagration, and you are bound to extinguish it, without molestation or injury to us. We have broken no compact; we have never interfered with your opinions; we have raised no unjust clamour against you. The existing evils are of your own creation, and you have no right to make us the victims to appease the wrath which you yourselves have excited. The condition of our hapless country is deplorable; the state of our own Church is distressing; but my friends and myself are guiltless of these calamities. Let those answer for them who produced them; "we have neither lot nor part in the matter."

How strange it is, that the favoured work of God upon earth, is that being in all nature which seems least to answer the design of its creation! I was never more forcibly impressed with this melancholy fact, than upon the evening of Monday last, when travelling over the beautiful district of country between Dungiven and this place. The glorious sun cast his golden mantle over the mountains, and the valleys reposed in shade; the song of cheerfulness ascended from the peasants at their toil, whilst the children were joyfully collecting fuel for the bonfires and festivities of Midsummer's eve. As far as the eye could reach, innumerable flocks and herds were browsing in peace upon the green pastures, and the very air was impregnated with myriads of animated beings. Throughout the wide extent around and above me, all was life, and tranquillity, and happiness. Not a single sound of sorrow smote upon the ear, nor a single object of misery passed before the eye. In the midst of that glorious temple of Nature, my soul instinctively ascended in devout aspirations of adoration and gratitude, to the benignant Author of such extended and diversified enjoyment. I felt happier in my own existence, and in that of all animated creatures; and I did not believe there was a being upon earth, whom such a scene would not have soothed into tranquillity and benevolence. In this, however, I fear I was mistaken; for in journeying on through an ever-varying scene of beauty and happiness, I think I did discover *one* object uncongenial with the time, and the circumstances, and the place. It was a Christian Minister, travelling to this scene of our meeting! His eye dwelt upon me, but not in friendly recognition; his face was towards me, but no smile played upon his features. My heart sunk within me, to think that men, and Christian men, should have been the only beings, who, on that glorious evening, were deficient in kindly affections. Oh! surely such things are not congenial with our country, nor with our religion. Nature has given us a fair and fertile abode—Providence has blessed us with generous hearts and liberal hands—and the Gospel of peace has long been the inmate of our dwellings. Why, then, is our country a universal theatre of contention? Why are Christians of the same communion arrayed against each other? Why? Because men presumptuously interfere with the conscientious belief of their brethren, and spend that time in forming plans of annoyance, which ought to be dedicated to offices of peace!

I do appeal to my brethren, whether these be times in which any Church, and especially any Presbyterian Church, should occupy itself in devising schemes for the curtailment of Christian liberty? Is it in the nineteenth

century, when even Catholicity is evidently relaxing her grasp—when the Established Clergy and the Legislature, have given a signal proof of the progress of liberal opinions, in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts—is it at such a time, that we should retrograde, and surrender the fundamental principles of our Church? If we do, a death-wound will be inflicted upon Presbyterianism—division will follow usurpation—weakness will succeed division—and though individuals may chiefly suffer in the beginning, the Church must suffer in the end.

From the excited state of public feeling, and from the observations of many Ministers and Elders, I think it is evident that we are not, at present, in a proper condition to come to a sound and impartial conclusion upon the important subject before us, which involves the very constitution of our Church. I therefore do entreat my brethren to pause, and to allow these weighty matters to lie over for consideration, as enjoined by the salutary regulations of our Code of Discipline, for at least one year. In the mean time, the popular ferment will have time to subside; and I now beg leave, in great seriousness and sincerity, to propose a plan to our opponents, which, I firmly believe, would ultimately lead to the triumph of truth. I know that my opinions have been grossly caricatured and misrepresented; and it is possible, that in our hands, yours may have suffered in the same way. Now, whilst we continue without any regular channel for the mutual interchange and explanation of our opinions, these misconceptions must be perpetuated. From the very nature of man, the Pulpit will increase instead of diminishing misapprehensions. Confident in his own views, every Minister will necessarily bring them forward with the greatest possible force; whilst, without any impeachment of his honesty, he may not introduce the strongest arguments of his opponents. If this be the case, under the most favourable supposition, how much less chance is there of truth being ascertained, where ignorance, prejudice, or dishonesty is concerned! The Press, in its present state, will not be more effectual. The multitude of trashy, virulent, and unprincipled pamphlets that are put forth, and which are read only by partisans, have no tendency but to inflame the passions, and mislead the mind. That calmness, seriousness, and deliberation, which are necessary for the investigation of truth, can never be attained under such a system. The contending parties must have the means of deliberately comparing their opinions with each other, and with the Word of God; and also of correcting any mistakes or misrepresentations that may occur, before justice can be done to both sides. Such an investigation might show us, that we do not differ so much as we now imagine, and thereby bring us nearer to each other; and, at all events, it would make our respective systems be better understood. In order to accomplish this most desirable end, I propose, seriously and affectionately, *That a Monthly Publication shall be issued, at the mutual expense, and under the mutual management, of Calvinists and Unitarians, in which each party shall occupy the same number of pages* (*say* 30 or 50), *with articles in support of their peculiar opinions, either original or selected, as they may deem expedient.* Such a work would be eagerly read by all parties; the sparks of truth would be elicited by collision, and the ancient piles of error would be consumed. *Falsehood* is only dangerous when she walks forth alone: having a bold air and confident demeanour, she awes the timid, and imposes upon the weak; but she cannot long appear in the presence of her lovely rival, *Truth*, until the counterfeit is detected.

To my Calvinistic brethren, such a proposal must be peculiarly acceptable, as it will afford them free admission into what they call the dominions of Error: for I here pledge myself, that we will place the Publication within reach of all *our* hearers, provided they will do the same with regard to *theirs*. We will most sincerely thank them, if they can con-

vince us, by sound argument and the Word of God, that we are wrong. In the triumph of Truth, we shall most heartily rejoice; it is all our aim; and if they prove her to be on their side, we shall instantly desert the ranks of her enemies, and join the cohorts of her friends. *We* can have no motive for clinging to error: the applause of the world, the fashion of the world, the interests of the world, are all upon the opposite side. And I can assure you, that we are not so destitute of the ordinary feelings of men, as to prefer, without good cause, an angry sky and barren rocks, to bright and fertile regions. On the voyage of life, we would much prefer sailing before the gentle breeze of popular favour, to being "tossed by the tempest of evil tongues;" but we know that "favour is deceitful," and whatever may befal us, we shall not, at least, "make shipwreck of our integrity."

I am confident my proposal will not be declined by our opponents, upon the futile pretext, of not desiring to circulate what they are pleased to call "*poison:*" for they know that their powerful *antidote* will go along with it. We might, just with as much reason, call their opinions "*poison*," but we are so confident of the efficacy of our own *remedies*, that we have no fear of its effects. If, in bringing our separate systems to the standard of the Word of God, the comparison should be in our favour, no doubt we will be gratified; but should the result be against us, we shall still be pleased—we shall cheerfully confess our error, and heartily embrace the truth.

I do, therefore, most earnestly entreat this Synod to pause, and to adhere to its own established and salutary laws. Delay, in so important a case, cannot be dangerous; but precipitancy may involve the most deplorable consequences. Whatever may be the result of my appeal, however, I shall never cease to be sincerely grateful for the patience, the kindness, and the attention, with which I have been heard, through so tedious and desultory an address.

Mr. *R. Stewart* (Broughshane), said, Moderator, although I am fully aware, that professions of respect for those with whom in religious opinions we differ, generally go for nothing, and that your time at present is very precious, I cannot deny myself the opportunity of disclaiming all personal hostility towards my Arian brethren. For all of them I entertain good-will, for many of them high respect, and for those with whom I have been more intimately acquainted, the most affectionate regard. I am truly sorry, Sir, that any thing like personal abuse should have been resorted to, either on the one side or the other. Truth can never be advanced by invective, nor is it a likely way to banish error, to apply degrading epithets to persons who are under its influence. This grievance, however, is not all on the side of my Arian brethren. We also have had our share of the abuse. Some of the public Journals have abounded with the grossest misrepresentations of our motives and conduct. In a work, with which some of this body are said to be intimately connected, I, and several of my friends, have had the honour of occupying a very prominent place, and of being exhibited in every possible way to public scorn and reprobation. My observations, at last meeting of Synod, were published in such a mutilated and garbled form, that I myself could scarcely recognise them. I was made to say, that we ought to dismiss the Clerk of the Synod, *solely* because our continuing him in office might injure us in the estimation of Government; although it is well known that I brought in the measure, and voted for his continuance in office. It was stated, that I "*attempted*" to explain an apparent inconsistency in the preface of my published sermon; and when, on a future occasion, I published the explanation, and complained that it had been omitted by the Synodical Reporter, I was unceremoniously accused of falsehood; and it was alleged, that the statement "Mr. Stewart attempted to explain," was an impartial statement of the explanation. I

do not state these things with any view to redress, but solely to show, that if Arians have been exposed to popular odium, by abusive and unjust representations, as they allege, we also have shared the same fate. In the observations with which I am about to trouble you, I shall studiously avoid every epithet that might irritate or provoke, when I attempt to reply to my eloquent friend, Mr. Montgomery—for I will still call him *friend*, notwithstanding our difference of opinion.—(Hear, hear, from different quarters, and especially from Mr. Montgomery.) Every one will admit. that my task is no sinecure. Such a flow of powerful and commanding eloquence I never heard; and were the principles and reasoning as sound and conclusive as the language is beautiful and appropriate, I should consider the speech of my learned friend absolutely unanswerable. Mr. Montgomery, however, and the greater number of the gentlemen who have joined him, assume the following principles as the basis of their reasoning, and these, I think, a little close and candid investigation will show to be unsound. They assume, that the declaration of faith made this and last year in the Synod, together with the present Overtures, are an infringement of civil and religious liberty; that the right of private judgment includes under it the right of public teaching; that the people of any congregation are the property of the Minister who happens to have been ordained amongst them; that to them he has a prescriptive right; that when parents have gone to expense in the education of their children for the ministry of the gospel in connexion with this Synod, it is unjust to deny them admission on the ground of religious opinion, and that simple or honest error is neither criminal nor dangerous. You will find all these assumptions in the speech of my learned friend; and I shall begin to show how unfounded they are, by simply stating what is the nature of the measures, against which my friend has exerted his eloquence. As a Church, you call upon your members, in the spirit of candour, to state openly, not an opinion which you dictate, but what is their own opinion respecting a most important fundamental article of religious belief. You do this because a most injurious representation has gone abroad, that many in your body entertain, upon that subject, very erroneous sentiments; and that some of them are base enough to cloak, under obsequious, and apparently orthodox expressions, their real, but exceptionable opinions. Now, what infringement of civil and religious liberty is there in this? What similarity to the "rack," the "gibbet," the torturing irons, and other instruments of inquisitorial tyranny, dwelt upon with such honest indignation, by my learned friend? Did we go to every private individual in the community, and say to him, Sir, you must state to us your religious belief; and had we the power, in case of finding him heterodox, to punish him by any species of bodily torture or civil deprivation, then would there be some basis for the reasoning of Mr. Montgomery; but to such a measure we have neither the power nor the inclination to resort. We call upon our members to be honest men—to openly state what they privately believe, on a subject which we have commissioned them publicly to preach—and is this tyranny or torture? Alas! for the honesty, and liberality, and candour, that feels it to be torture to be brought into the light. Your uniform practice, since you were a Synod, has been to call upon young men to declare before their people, at their ordination, their views of religious belief; and this has never been felt or alleged to be torture. How, then, does it change its character, and become inquisitorial cruelty, when applied to men who have been for some years ordained? Is not every member still under the care of the Church? and does it not possess the right to superintend, as well as to appoint its members? You do not interfere with any man's private judgment. He may have, and think what he pleases, in his private capacity; but when he chooses to offer himself as a public teacher of the people committed to your care

by the Almighty Head of his Church, you first ask him what he proposes to teach; and, when you afterwards hear that he has fallen from what you think to be the truth, you call upon him to state his religious views of doctrine, lest he should teach God's people error. With respect to the Overtures, they are simply a precautionary measure against the recurrence of an evil in future, the existence of which you now lament.

When our forefathers settled in this country, they were all of the same views upon the fundamental doctrines of Christianity; and it is manifest, that no man would have proposed or expected to become a member, who did not entertain the same religious opinions. What particular symbol of faith, or creed, as it is commonly called, they, in the first instance, used, I do not know; but, as you have been told by another gentleman, about the year 1705, they all subscribed the Westminster Confession of Faith—not by compulsion, but as a voluntary act. The original constitution of the Synod of Ulster was undoubtedly orthodox. Every member entered its ministry, under the cover of alleged orthodoxy; and I myself remember the first instance, in the case of the late minister of Ballee, in which a member of their body declared himself an Arian. I well remember, Sir, the amazement and consternation expressed in every countenance, at the audacious and novel avowal! Every man looked at his neighbour, as if at a loss how to think or act; and when he was sent back on trial to his congregation, in the expectation, which eventually proved well founded, that they would not retain him as their minister, that measure was followed up by a strong protest. Whether Arians continued from that to the present period, to increase in numbers or not, it is manifest that Arianism became every day bolder. It seemed to forget, that its origin in the body, was under the shade, and began to exhibit itself in open day, as though it had not been a fungus growing out of the body, but an original and integral part of it. In these circumstances, the orthodox members, who are the lineal and consistent *descendants* and *successors* of those men by whom the Synod was formed, have deemed it expedient to take some steps to eradicate what they believe to be a disease in the body. For this purpose, two medical plans have been proposed. The one is, to use the knife of the surgeon, and amputate the diseased part. The other is, to give the body internal medicine, which, without any painful present operation, may finally conduct it to convalescence and health. Of the former kind, is the plan of a separation betwixt the Orthodox and Arian members. Of the latter, are the Overtures. I am not a friend to the plan of a division of the Synod, because I do admit, that several of the Arian members entered the body, avowedly holding the same opinions which they now avow. I confess that I know, that when Mr. Montgomery became a member, that he was far from being orthodox. Indeed I believe that he entertained opinions much more exceptionable than those he has since avowed. I also admit, that those who entered the Synod as Arians, have since conducted themselves with every propriety; and that, of course, it would be a kind of violation of public faith, to cast them out or cut them off. I am an enemy to separation also, on the grounds that it would increase Arian influence, by enlarging the Antrim Presbytery; by depriving orthodox members of the opportunity of preaching in Arian pulpits, or planting orthodox members in vacancies whose ministers had formerly been Arian; and because that the laity, in orthodox congregations, are divided in opinion about the propriety and expediency of the measure. Whilst the watchman of the Church slept, in the period that is past, the tares of Arianism were sown, and have grown up with the wheat! I do not, therefore, like to root them up, lest the wheat be plucked up with them; but I would advise every exertion to keep the watchman awake, that no tare may be sown in future; and this is the object of the Overtures. My learned friend, has, with fascinating elo-

quence, dwelt upon the hardships to which young men will be subjected by the Overtures; and amongst these, he has particularised the differences in opinion which will exist in the Committee of Examination. Amongst the splendid and varied talents which Mr. Montgomery possesses, one of the most shining, is a power of anticipating the future, and painting it in such colours as are best calculated to serve his purpose. If a consequence may possibly follow from any principle or measure, my friend will boldly take it for granted, will add to it the imaginary consequence, and so on, till he has conjured up a picture of disasters so appalling, that no wise man would approach it. Of this you have had a specimen. Dr. Wright and Mr. Johnston have differed in opinion. The one, he says, is an Arminian, and the other a Calvinist. And he hence assumes, that every Examination Committee will be composed of Dr. Wright and Mr. Johnston; and that the young men will be tossed between the horns of these two theological systems. They will be swallowed up either in the Scylla of the one or the Charybdis of the other. I do not charge my learned friend, who is remarkable for candour, with purposed disingenuousness; but it was certainly unfair to refer to the difference of opinion between Dr. Wright and Mr. Johnston, when he knew that Mr. Johnston publicly stated, that Dr. Wright had mistaken him, when he charged him with Arminian views of faith—that Dr. Wright expressed himself happy to find that he had mistaken Mr. Johnston—and that there remained no difference whatever between them. So that, you see, Sir, my learned friend has no foundation for his surmises respecting division in the Committee of Examination; and, of course, this part of his speech falls wholly to the ground, with the exception of its eloquence. Mr. Montgomery, however, argues that there must be division of religious opinion among Christians, because there is variety in the human countenance, and beauty is said to consist in variety. I believe the definition of beauty to which my friend refers, is, that it consists in uniformity amidst variety; and I assert, that whilst there are various shades of difference in the expression and complexion of the countenances which we see around us, there is a striking uniformity in the number and character of the human features, by which the countenance of man is distinguished from all the inferior, and probably from all superior creatures. Now, I adopt my learned friend's simile, and I allege that there can be no real religious communion, when, at the same time that there are shades of variety of opinion in minor matters, there is not a uniformity in the just foundation of religion. I do not say that Arians deny the Lord that bought them, because they do not deny what they believe him to be; but I say, that they deny what I believe to be the Lord that bought sinners, when they deny the essential Deity of the Son of God. I do not say that they cannot be saved, for it is not my prerogative; but I say, that I cannot see how I could be saved did I hold their views. I will not call them infidels, but they are unbelievers in what I believe the foundation of all religious truth.

My learned friend would represent the difference between Trinitarians and Arians as only like the varieties in the human countenance. I wish I could agree with him in this; but, in my opinion, the difference between them is an important and fundamental difference. They do not, in my mind, worship the same God, trust in the same Saviour, or look for sanctification to the same Holy Spirit. The Evangelist John, i. 18. states, that "no man hath seen God at any time," the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him. Whatever the God of the Scriptures is, that is the God worshipped by the Orthodox! Having ascertained, by their reason, what is God's Word, they surrender, upon the sublime subject of the nature of him whom "no man hath seen at any time," to that Word their understandings, and believe that the one God exists—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The God of the Arian, on the contrary, is the production of his own reason! He is a "monad"—a unit, a phrase which seems to me to imply, that Arians have circumscribed the Deity in their minds—that they have separated him on every side from all other things, and are able to comprehend the manner of his existence! The Saviour, also, of the Arian, is different from the Saviour on whom the Orthodox depend. The Arians' Saviour is a superior, *created* intelligence; the Saviour of the Orthodox is, "God over all, blessed for ever." I believe, that my Redeemer is every where present; that he is in my going out and coming in, lying down and rising up; that he is acquainted with all my ways, and surrounds me with his eternal arms. I have comfort and confidence in his salvation, because he is a present help, ready to succour me in the hour of temptation. The Arian believes, that the Saviour is at the right hand of their "monad." They pray through him, but they will not pray to him; they honour him as the highest of created beings, but they deny him omniscience and omnipresence, and do not consider him worthy to receive divine worship. The same difference exists between the Arian and Trinitarian views, respecting the Holy Ghost. In the mind of the Arian, he is a subordinate spirit; in that of the Orthodox, whosoever "lies unto the Holy Ghost, lies unto God," Acts v. 3. The difference, therefore, between the Arian and Orthodox, is truly a fundamental difference; it respects the object of worship—the Saviour, through whom worship is offered up, and the Spirit by which we are enabled to worship acceptably. Where men are agreed upon these important points, all other shades or varieties of opinion, I consider, with my friend, like the varieties of the human countenance. Christians belong to the same family when they agree on these points, although there may be shades of variety in the complexion of their less important opinions; but where they differ upon these, the difference is like that between the inhabitants of different portions of the globe—it points them out as almost of distinct and different species. In my mind, therefore, there can be no real religious communion between Arians and Trinitarians: they may pray for each other, but they cannot be said to join together in prayer. Mr. Montgomery thinks it unjust to deprive an Arian Minister of the emolument arising from his office, because he has a family. I will put to him a question on this subject. Suppose that, in his capacity of Head Master of the English School, in the Institution, he employs a writing-master, whom, upon trial, he finds totally incapable of teaching writing, will he continue him in office because he has a wife and children? Or, suppose the man was at one time an elegant writer, but, by some accident, loses all the fingers of his hand, and is rendered incapable of forming a letter, the man and his friends may plead his large family, and utter helplessness, if he be turned off; but the parents of the children, and Mr. Montgomery, will speak only of his incapacity: and is the salvation of souls of less value than that of teaching writing? The Orthodox believe, that the salvation of souls is endangered by an Arian ministry; and when the Orthodox discover that it has committed the care of souls to an Arian Minister, there is surely no injustice in doing in the Church what Mr. Montgomery would do in his school—dismiss what they believe to be the incompetent member. My learned friend charges the Overtures with injustice, because they will prevent his and other Arian congregations from obtaining, in case of vacancy, a member of their own religious views; and he alleges, that should they get one from a distance, they would be deprived of the Regium Donum. I am again unwilling to charge him with disingenuousness, but certainly, he could not be ignorant that the Bounty is granted to the Synod of Ulster and Presbytery of Antrim, and that were his, or any other congregation, to withdraw from the Synod, and connect themselves with the Antrim Presbytery, the Bounty would flow to them through as direct a channel

as when in connection with the Synod. Government have the one Agent of the Bounty for both bodies, and the change would never be by them observed. He thinks it wrong, that young men should be called upon to express their religious views. ("No, no," from Mr. Montgomery, "I think they should all let their opinions be known.") Mr. S.—I am glad to hear it. It shows that even Mr. Montgomery can be farther informed. At Strabane, last year, he opposed the measure of the members of the Synod, stating publicly and openly their views, with all his might. He fought every inch of ground, and was only overcome by a majority. He was then wise, superlatively wise, yet now he is wiser; he is the Greek superlative mode more than superlative. If it be not wrong to call upon young men to express their religious opinions, it is easy to justify the Overtures, if they are intended solely to show to young men, during the early period of their education, on what principles they will be admitted members of the Synod of Ulster. They will see in these Overtures, the religious opinion of the Synod; and if theirs be different, they will be prevented from wasting their time, and enabled to direct their attention to some other pursuit.

Mr. Montgomery says, that religion is a concern between a man and his God. I admit it most fully; but, as I have already stated, there is a difference between private judging and public teaching. The Synod do not propose to interpose between any Arian and his God; to his own master they leave him to stand or fall; but they feel called upon to interpose between him and their people, and prevent him from leading them, as they think, astray. My eloquent friend has made a most extraordinary proposal. He says, that he believes what an orthodox Minister (suppose Mr. Carlile) preaches to be poison, and that Mr. Carlile believes what he preaches to be poison, and he proposes that they should exchange and circulate each others' poison. I have read of two French hair-dressers who magnanimously challenged each other into the field to decide some quarrel in mortal conflict; but when they met, and beheld the instruments of death, each was seized with such a tremor, that the humane seconds, who were Irishmen, said it was impossible that they should perform their parts in person. They therefore kindly agreed to do the work for them, and each proposed to shoot his friend's opponent! Now, the chivalry of my eloquent friend, is something like the conduct of these Irish seconds. "I think your doctrine poison," says he, "and you think mine poison; I will therefore make an agreement with you—poison you my people, and I will poison yours!" I must inform my learned friend, however, that the cases are not equal. In the Orthodox system is included all that Arians believe to be essential to salvation, and something more; but in the Arian system, what the Orthodox consider of the greatest value is wanting. The Arian in the exchange would get all he wished, and could easily lay the overplus aside; but the Orthodox would get nothing that he thought of any value. I would not, therefore, make the exchange proposed I would give Mr. Montgomery's people what I believe to be wholesome spiritual bread, but I would not circulate among my people what I believe to be poison. (Hear, hear, from Messrs. Porter and Morell.) Mr. S.—Yes, you may call hear, hear, and you may make any use of it you please, but I repeat it, I would not willingly be instrumental in giving what I believe to be poison to any human being, nor do I think that my learned friend could consistently do it. Indeed, I have a much better opinion of him, than to think he would propose it, did he believe that the doctrines of Orthodoxy were spiritual poison. He is too conscientious and benevolent to become a spiritual assassin; and did he believe of Orthodox doctrines, as the Orthodox do of the Arian system, he would be the last man in the world to propose circulating them among his people. In all kinds of food, whether animal or vegetable, there is a portion that is poison.

Taken as a whole, it is nutricious; but decompose it, and you will get a part of it totally unfit for the support of animal life. Even the commonest, the peculiar vegetable of our country, the potato, if deprived of its farina, becomes useless, if not deleterious. Now, in the judgment of the Orthodox, their own system is the entire, the wholesome vegetable, but when deprived of its peculiar doctrines, it becomes like the useless residue; and Orthodox Ministers could not, therefore, in consequence, feed God's people with what they consider husks, in place of the sweeter food of the Word.

My learned friend charges the Orthodox with claiming to themselves infallibility; but I deny the charge. We only exercise our right of private judgment. It appears to us, on full and candid examination, that *such* is the nature of the Gospel of Christ, and we know of no authority that Arians have to interfere with our right of private judgment. We doom them to neither temporal nor eternal penalties. They may establish congregations where they can, assemble with whom they choose, and teach what they please, to those who believe in their doctrines; but we cannot join with them, nor circulate their works. My learned friend says, that in adopting a creed, we identify ourselves with the Romish Church. This also I deny. The Romish creed makes additions to the Word of God—ours only states what we believe that Word to contain. The Romish creed supersedes the Word of God—ours leads us to it; and the Romish creed asserts its infallibility, and curses all who will not believe it—ours says, all human compositions are fallible and imperfect, and is proposed as a guide only to those who think it agreeable to the Divine Word. My learned friend has laid great weight upon the learned, the noble, and the rich, so many of whom belong to his communion; and he seems to assume that the Orthodox cannot be the true faith, because it is generally acceptable to the illiterate and the poor! Here, again, I differ widely from him. I do not deny, that men of learning, intelligence, and wealth, may be rich in faith; but I deny that there is a presumption in their favour. The Apostles of our Lord were illiterate and poor. When John the Baptist sent to inquire of our Lord, if he were the Christ, he gave, among other signs of his being the Messiah, that the poor had the gospel preached unto them. In 1 Cor. i. 21. we are told that after the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased him, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe; and in verse 26, he says, "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are." Although, therefore, Mr. Montgomery says he would consult a Locke or a Newton, and although he seems to think, that, in their intelligence and learning, there would be a presumption of their having arrived at the truth, I consider it safer to follow the inspired Apostle, and seek truth only from the Spirit of God, believing that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither knoweth them, because they are spiritually discerned. It has been argued by some of our opponents, that the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be true, because some dignitaries of the Church, and learned men, have uttered absurdities in fruitless attempts to explain it. But as well might it be argued, that the material world has no existence, because Bishop Berkley has published many absurdities concerning it! The subject is too high for human thought, and the Scriptures have not attempted to explain [reveal] it. It is, therefore, useless, if not impious, for us to make the attempt.

The last topic in my learned friend's speech, which I shall mention, is, that "simple error," by which, I presume, he means, error which is

believed to be truth, is no crime. This, it seems, is Mr. Montgomery's opinion; but it is not that of the Apostle Paul! In the 10th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, he says of the Jews, "For I bear them record, that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." It is manifest, therefore, that the Jews were, in the fudgment of the Apostle, in error. Their zeal "was not according to knowledge." It is also manifest, that it was simple or honest error, for it was "a zeal of God;" and yet it was so far from being harmless, that the Apostle again declares, [had in the preceding chapter declared,] that "he could wish himself accursed from Christ," (that is, separated from the public ministry of the word,) on their account, if that might be the means of introducing them to the knowledge of Jesus.

I trust, Sir, that you and this house will see, that these Overtures are liable to none of those objections charged upon them by my eloquent friend —that they are not calculated to abridge *our* religion, much less our civil liberties! They do not interfere between a man and his God! They leave *every* man at *liberty* to choose for himself—to be fully persuaded in his *own* mind: only, they provide, that those who join the communion of the Synod, should be persons of the *same* religion with its *present* members, that in order to their *walking* together, all may be agreed!—In conclusion, I lament that any unhandsome epithets should have passed from the one to the other side of the house. In this respect, I freely acknowledge, that the greater portion of blame has been on the Orthodox side. We ought to hold the truth, nothing doubting, and be ready to give an answer to any one that asketh a reason of the hope that is in us; but we should do it in meekness and fear. Mr. S. then stated, that there were several topics, chiefly referring to Mr. Montgomery's speech of last year, of which he had taken down notes, but he omitted them on account of the lateness of the hour, and because he knew they would be taken up by some others of his friends.

It was now past three o'clock, and, whilst a number of speakers presented themselves to the house, there were loud and continued cries of "roll, roll."

Mr. Cooke said, that, as the assembly appeared to have made up their minds on this subject, he would willingly consent to suppress his speech, if other gentlemen would do the same.

There was some confusion for a few minutes, when "roll, roll," was loudly repeated. The roll was then called on the Amendment, when

99 Ministers voted "Pass."	40 Ministers voted "Not Pass."
40 Elders do. do.	17 Elders do. do.
139 *Pass.*	57 *Not Pass.*

Majority for the Amendment, 82.

A number of Ministers and Elders then entered on the Minutes of the Synod, the following *Protest*:—

"We, the undersigned Ministers and Elders, protest against the decision of Synod, in this case, for the following, amongst other reasons:

"1. Because, the Overture contains several statements respecting the opinions and characters of the Ministers of the Church, which we consider to be unfounded and injurious.

"2. Because, subjecting our Students and Licentiates to the control of an ever-varying Committee of Synod, who may be under the influence of personal feelings, or local connections, appears to be imposing subscription to human interpretations of the Word of God, in a form more objectionable than has ever been attempted in any other Church.

"3. Because, human Tests and Confessions have, in all ages, tended to encourage hypocrisy—to restrict the right of private judgment—to lessen the authority of Scripture—and to prevent that free inquiry and

discussion, which are essential to the extension of religious knowledge, and of which truth need not be afraid.

"4. Because, all attempts to produce a uniformity of belief, have hitherto entirely failed, and, from the nature of man, must continue to fail; whilst they have created unrighteous divisions among Christians—thrown a shield over the time-server—and exposed the conscientious to injuries and persecutions, as the case of the two thousand Ministers ejected by the Act of conformity, under Charles II. incontestibly proves.

"5. Because, as Presbyterian Protestants, we will never surrender the fundamental principle of the Reformation, which forbids us to call any man, or body of men, 'Lord or Master,' considering one only is our master, even Christ, and that all we are brethren.

"6. Because, we believe that the Sacred Scriptures, 'given by inspiration of God,' are the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and, as we are determined to submit to no other standard ourselves, but 'to hold fast the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free,' so we shall never be accessory to subjecting the opinions of others to any human interference, save such explanations as may take place between Pastors and People.

"7. Because, if any Creed, or Test of religious belief, contain nothing but what is to be found in the Bible, is superfluous; and if it contain any thing contrary to the Bible, it is pernicious—calculated to mislead the understanding—to prevent the progress of truth—and to perpetuate error.

"8. Because the Overture, just passed, must eventually trench upon the most valuable rights of the People, in the free election of their Ministers; inasmuch as their choice must be restricted to persons professing to hold the opinions approved by your Committee, although such opinions should not be agreeable to the views of sacred truth, entertained by the Congregation.

"9. Because, although some of us believe in the doctrine of the Trinity, we consider it improper to impose the belief of that, or any other controverted doctrine, upon others, as a necessary condition of Christian communion; and we are, therefore, determined to embrace the earliest opportunity of pressing the repeal, or a sufficient modification of the Overture.

"10. Because we regard it as exceedingly preposterous, to require Students to profess this belief in some of the most obtuse and difficult points of Theology, even before they have entered the Theological Class.

"11. Because we consider this proceeding as a direct breach of faith with those Students and Licentiates, who have entered our Church, under our previous Regulations.

"12. Because, whilst in the recent repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in England, we have a gratifying proof of the increasing liberality of the Country and the Legislature, we consider it reproachful to any Protestant, and more especially to any Presbyterian Church, to impose any restrictions upon liberty of conscience, and freedom of inquiry, in matters of faith."

"(Signed by 23 Ministers and 17 Elders.)"

The Sixteenth Anniversary of the Kent and Sussex Association, was held at Tenterden, on Wednesday, 25th June. The introductory services were taken by the Rev. E. Talbot of Tenterden, and the Rev. W. Stevens of Maidstone. The Rev. G. Harris of Glasgow, delivered, in his usually eloquent and impressive manner, a very interesting and forcible discourse, from the words of Philip, John xiv. 8. "Show us the Father." After the service, —— Brent, Esq. of Canterbury, was called to the Chair; and in their Report of proceedings, the Committee made reference to a project, which has engaged their attention for some time past, and which, under the management of the present Commitee, will, in all probability, be brought into full operation. They hope, before

the next anniversary, with the co-operation of the Sussex Association, and the Southern Unitarian Fund, to have a permanent Missionary of respectable talents and acquirements, whose labours shall be devoted exclusively to the three counties of Kent, Sussex, and Hampshire. Within this range, are many infant societies that need the fostering care of a Missionary, besides many towns and villages, where Unitarian Christianity is scarcely known, except through the medium of gross misrepresentation.—After the business of the Society had been transacted, the friends of the Institution retired to the Wool Pack Inn, to a comfortable and economical dinner. The Rev. G. Harris in the Chair. The company, the largest the Society had ever known to have met together on a similar occasion since its existence, amounted to 145; about fifty others entered the room, after the dinner. The sentiments that at different times proceeded from the Chair, as well as those from many others who addressed the company, expressed congratulation on the progress of liberality, the harbinger of truth and virtue, and conveyed heartfelt wishes, that it may advance with an accelerated step, till every restraint upon freedom of thought shall be removed, that Jesus may have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession. The Society will meet the next year at Northiam.

The Western Unitarian Society held its Annual Meeting at Yeovil, in Somersetshire, on the 16th July. This was one of the earliest Unitarian Associations established in England, for the promotion of knowledge by the distribution of books. The Rev. W. Turner, Jun. commenced the morning's devotion; the Rev. T. Davis of Evesham, gave the prayer before the Sermon, and a highly interesting discourse was delivered by the Rev. H. Hutton of Birmingham, from the words, "If any man trust that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's." At the meeting for business, Mr. Baker of Ilminster, was called to the Chair. The Minutes of the Committee were read by Mr. Fry of Bristol, the Secretary. Mr. Hutton was unanimously requested to publish his sermon. A public dinner was held in the afternoon, Isaac Davy, Esq. of Crediton, Chairman: various sentiments were given and spoken to, by Messrs. Davy, Turner, Davis, Hutton, Dr. Carpenter, Fry, and Harris; and a vote of thanks to William Smith, Esq. M. P. for his steady and undeviating advocacy of the principles of Civil and Religious freedom, was unanimously adopted. In the evening, the devotional service was conducted by Mr. Harris of Glasgow; and a most impressive and affecting sermon, on glorifying God through Christ Jesus, was preached by the Rev. Dr. Carpenter of Bristol. In the introduction, which was a delightful appeal to the best feelings of human nature, the preacher dwelt on the moral impossibility of any one who had *practically* embraced the doctrines of the Oneness and Fatherly character of Deity, abandoning those sentiments for the cheerless reveries of infidelity, or the withering mysteries of the popular theology. No one who heard that address will ever forget it. For ourselves, we never listened to any discourse so calculated to do good—to elevate the mind—to amend the heart. The meeting, altogether, was truly instructive and delightful; there were 18 ministers present. The statement of facts illustrative of the progress of mankind in knowledge and freedom, was highly encouraging, and the motives to persevering and increasing exertion, deducible from the interchange of friendly sentiment, were great, and, we are persuaded, will be lasting.

On Thursday evening, a religious service was held in the Chapel at Yeovil, Messrs. S. Martin of Trowbridge, and H. Hutton, taking the first part, and the sermon being preached by Mr. Harris.

JAMES HEDDERWICK AND SON, PRINTERS, GLASGOW.

GTU Library
3 2400 00269 7930